

REPORT

of

**Executive Officers—Executive
Council—Departments**

and

Standing Committees

of the

**MASSACHUSETTS
STATE LABOR COUNCIL
AFL-CIO**



1971-1972

Fourteenth Convention

October 5-8, 1971

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS



REPORT

of

**Executive Officers—Executive
Council—Departments**

and

Standing Committees

of the

**MASSACHUSETTS
STATE LABOR COUNCIL
AFL-CIO**



Fourteenth Convention

October 5-8, 1971

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

OFFICERS



President

SALVATORE CAMELIO

Secretary-Treasurer

JAMES P. LOUGHLIN

Executive Vice Presidents

DANIEL F. MURRAY

JOSEPH A. SULLIVAN

Vice Presidents

ARTHUR ANTCIL

HENRY J. KHOURY

JOHN J. BARRON

JAMES B. LAVIN

THOMAS BINNALL

ALBERT F. LITANO

EDWARD C. BRUNELLE

JAMES R. MCCARTHY

ELDRIDGE W. BUFFUM

JOSEPH D. McLAUGHLIN

GUY CAMPOBASSO

DAVID P. MCSWEENEY

GIRO CARDINAL

JAMES F. MULLONEY

ROSE CLAFFEY

HELEN T. O'DONNELL

JAMES A. DE ROSA

EDWARD F. O'NEIL

VINCENT DiNUNNO

FRED M. RAMSEY

ALFORD DYSON

THOMAS J. RUSH

BERT FARNHAM

FRANK A. SONSINI

MANUEL FERNANDES

JOSEPH STEFANI

GIL FERREIRA

RALPH VALENTINO

MICHAEL L. GRIECO

EDWARD WALL

REXFORD WENG

DEPARTMENTS

JAMES A. BROYER.....*Legislative Director*

ALBERT G. CLIFTON.....*Legislative Consultant*

JOHN A. CALLAHAN.....*Director, COPE*

GERARD KABLE....*Director Publications & Public Relations*

Executive Officers' Report

*To the Officers and Delegates to the Fourteenth Annual Convention of the
Massachusetts State Labor Council, AFL-CIO*

GREETINGS:

We are convening for our Fourteenth Annual Convention facing not only a great challenge to the principle of economic justice for which the American labor movement stands but also a grave threat to a democratic system upon which the very security of the entire nation rests.

The new economic policies enunciated by President Nixon on August 15 contained a 90-day wage-price freeze so filled with inequities that labor leaders throughout the country were forced to rise in protest. AFL-CIO President George Meany in a 15-minute Labor Day message called it an unequitable wage-price freeze "which unfairly requires workers to assume the major burden."

Just a short time before the President made his announcement of the wage-price freeze, in an article in the *Federationist*, Meany had described the state of the American economy as "just plain lousy," outlining the dimensions of the problem as follows: five million workers unemployed; hundreds of thousands have exhausted their unemployment compensation; the cost of living is going up at an annual rate of about 5.5 percent; in three years a half-million American jobs have been lost because of outmoded foreign trade policies; the number of people who live in poverty has grown to over 25 million; the unemployment rate among young returning GIs is over 13 percent; the unemployment rate among blacks is 10 percent and among teen-agers 17 percent; and among construction workers unemployment is over 10 percent.

"We are just plain fed up," said Meany, and added, "We want to put America back to work, reverse the destructive forces undermining the social stability of this nation, remind the government of its obligation, its responsibility, its duty.

"We insist on action. But in the light of experience, we see little prospect of constructive action from the Administration now in the White House.

"So we are looking to Congress for programs to get this nation moving again. This Congress and its predecessor have been constructive. They haven't done as much as they should, they haven't overridden as many ill-considered presidential vetoes as they should — but Congress has been a great deal more constructive than the Executive Branch."

In his message on Labor Day, Meany also criticized the announced border tax on some imports as a temporary stopgap at best, adding that "a border

tax will do very little to meet the major foreign trade problem created by the U. S.-based multi-national corporations and international banks, which have accounted for most of the export of American jobs."

On this very serious current state of international trade, President I. W. Abel of the Industrial Union Department had this to say:

"Our nation will soon become a permanent debtor in the world market if present U. S. import-export trends continue. Our imports of high-technology goods — the finished manufactures that have traditionally made up the best-paying of our exports — are pyramiding. We are reaching the point where we will no longer be selling more than we buy outside our own borders.

"When this happens, the results will include (1) inability to finance many of our foreign assistance commitments; (2) loss of an important source of highly skilled, well-paying jobs; and (3) most importantly, loss of control over our own economic destiny."

On August 26, speaking for the officers and members of this Council, President Camelio issued a statement in support of the national AFL-CIO's position on the Administration's new economic policies.

"We cannot go along," said Camelio, "with a program which freezes wages and allows profits and interest rates to run wild. All kinds of exemptions in the program will allow fluctuations in the prices of many of the things you buy — and yet the freeze on wages is so absolute as to be ridiculous in many instances."

He cited as an example a man hired two years ago at \$2.00 per hour with the understanding that his hourly rate would go to \$2.50 after a year and to \$3.00 after the second year. Since the employer's costs are predicated on these stepped-up hourly rates of pay, what actually happens if this employee's pay is frozen at \$2.50 an hour is that you are actually reducing his real wage by fifty cents an hour and putting that fifty cents in the pockets of his employer.

"Another questionable part of the Nixon program," said Camelio, "is the 10 percent tax credit handed out to the corporation supposedly for the purpose of giving them an incentive to expand production facilities. How in the name of common sense can you expect any immediate need for expansion when 25 percent of our present capacity is idle?"

"The Massachusetts State Labor Council," Camelio concluded, "stands unanimously opposed to President Nixon's wage-price freeze as presently formulated and calls upon the members of Congress to remove all inequities from the program before putting their stamp of approval on the package received from the White House."

At the time this is being written Congress has returned to Capitol Hill and is faced with the responsibility of acting on the Administration's new policy. As you read this in Convention, developments not recorded here have taken place — but it is easily predictable from this vantage point that the coming year will be filled with greater challenges than organized labor has had to face for many decades.

In other areas, the current Congress — before going on its summer vacation in August — had spent, or wasted, much time in trying to reassert its position in relation to the Executive Branch, particularly on the question of which branch of the government has the constitutional right to make or stop wars. Much time was also spent by individual members of the Democratic majority of Congress in grooming themselves as presidential timber for the 1972 election. Much major domestic legislation was as a result sadly neglected.

A national health security program had the highest priority in the 92nd Congress, but at this writing the AFL-CIO-supported bill introduced by Representatives Martha W. Griffiths of Michigan and James Corman of California and Senators Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts and William B. Saxbe of Ohio is still awaiting action. And much has still to be done on creating new jobs, a higher minimum wage, new housing, improved Social Security, trade legislation, welfare reform and consumer protection.

In The State

Here at the state level we have naturally felt the impact of the national deterioration of the economy. The unemployment rate in Massachusetts has consistently been above the national average and the loss of jobs through plant closings has been unprecedented, particularly in the shoe industry. The failure of the Nixon original "game plan" has had such a severe effect on Massachusetts that national attention focussed on the fact that thousands of technicians and engineers employed along Route 128 were forced to join the ranks of the unemployed.

Our Convention last year adjourned in the midst of an important election campaign. A leaflet distributed at the Convention had strongly made the point that "this year's election is nothing less than a referendum vote on the Nixon-Agnew Administration."

In terms of financial assistance and physical participation, the Massachusetts State Labor Council's COPE Department conducted an intensive election campaign throughout the state. Although its endorsed candidate for the Governorship was defeated, the Massachusetts congressional delegation remained 8 to 4 Democratic and in the Massachusetts General Court Democrats increased their strength to 30 to 10 in the Senate and 178 to 62 in the House.

The pace on Beacon Hill in Boston followed pretty closely the pattern set by Capitol Hill in Washington. The Massachusetts State Labor Council filed a total of forty-six bills. Nineteen of these bills called for changes in the Workmen's Compensation Act — changes not only to improve the benefit structure under the Act but also to correct the inadequate provisions which have allowed a backlog of more than 7,000 cases waiting to be heard by the Industrial Accident Board, some of them for several years. The importance of these bills and what has happened to them is more fully discussed in the Report of the Committee on Workmen's Compensation and in the Legislative Department Report elsewhere in these pages.

One thing we must say here is that our Committee on Workmen's Compensation, under the chairmanship of Ronald Orcutt of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers in Quincy has met more times and has done more work to bring about the enactment of these bills than has been done by any Committee at any time in the past. They have worked closely from the beginning of the year with President Salvatore Camelio and other officials of the Council to get action in the Legislature.

The officers of the Council launched into action early after our last Convention on matters that would come before the General Court. On November 25, 1970, with members of our Committee on Taxation, we had a meeting with members of the Special Commission to Develop a Master Tax Plan and Program for Taxation Within the Commonwealth to discuss an interim report outlining tentative proposals for a Master Tax Plan. Sen. George V. Kennedy, Jr., Chairman of the Commission, Rep. Frederick W. Schlosstein, Jr., a member, and Robert H. McClain, Jr., its Executive Director, were on hand to explain the proposals and answer questions.

During the meeting President Camelio pointed out that there was no mention of taxes on rental income in the Commission's interim report and the wisdom of tampering with the sales tax, mentioned in the report, was questioned. The members of the Commission countered that all criticism and suggestions made at meetings such as that one would be taken under consideration in the drafting of the final report. One proposal in the interim report that we could unanimously agree on was that which would have limited the percentage to the total tax burden from property taxes to 42%.

The Master Tax Plan somehow got lost in the shuffle during the see-saw battle between the Executive and the Legislative on how much more could be siphoned out of the pockets of the long-suffering taxpayers of Massachusetts — and while we narrowly escaped a boost in the sales tax the property owners of the Commonwealth will be unable to keep the grasping fingers of tax collectors from digging deeper into their pockets.

After the start of the legislative year, we arranged for direct confrontations with concerned members of the Legislature for discussions of our legislative program. The first was held on January 26 at the Statler-Hilton Hotel. Another, held at the Parker House on February 11, was co-sponsored by our COPE Department and the Greater Boston Central Labor Council. Throughout the year, other central labor bodies in conjunction with our COPE and Legislative Departments held similar meetings for discussions with legislators from their respective areas.

It should be noted also that our legislative functions as a Council involves more than lobbying for the enactment of our legislative proposals. As early as March we had already had to register our opposition to 45 anti-labor measures with the prospect at that time at at least another 120 such bills would have to be fought before the year was out.

Another thing that belongs under our activities on Beacon Hill is the fact that we took action on the Governor's choice of labor representatives to serve on the Meat and Poultry Advisory Board as set up under Chapter 891 of the General Laws. The Act specifically calls for appointment by the Gov-

ernor of two members named by the Massachusetts State Labor Council. The Council had sent in the names of Executive Vice President Joseph A. Sullivan and Vice President Rexford Weng, both connected with the Meatcutters Union, but they were bypassed by the Governor. The officers of the Council later met with the Governor on the matter and sought an opinion from the Attorney General's office.

Another action taken by the Council at its March meeting, was the position that state laws protecting women in heavy industries — in relation to hours of work, meal periods, night work, weight lifting and seating — could not be cancelled out by virtue of the new federal law giving women equal rights. As pointed out by AFL-CIO Legislative Director Andrew J. Biemiller, while these state laws may "not be of great importance to women in business and professional occupations, they are essential safeguards for the welfare of working women."

Other Activities

Secretary-Treasurer James P. Loughlin and Executive Vice President Daniel F. Murray were in Washington last November to represent the Massachusetts State Labor Council during the two-day Senate debate on the far-reaching occupational safety bill which has now established federal supervision over safety conditions wherever workers are employed. At the April meeting of the Council this year, Edward Garvin, a representative of Workplace Standards Administration of the U. S. Department of Labor, addressed the Council members on the provisions of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.

On January 14, Secretary-Treasurer Loughlin addressed a Luncheon Meeting of the M. I. T. Club of Boston, where he pointed out that the leaders of the American labor movement as well as the college-educated men and women who are responsible for the tremendous advances made in technology and in the sciences during the Twentieth Century, are dedicating their lives to "the proposition of making this a better world in which we can all live."

He then noted that while much progress has been made in making it easier to live and to work, "some of the greatest discoveries of modern science have been transformed into instruments of death and destruction." We have, he said, created an insufferable condition of air and water pollution. "And while we boast of being highly civilized," he added, "we are still unable to prevent or to stop wars. We are still fighting against racial discrimination, unemployment and slums. We are still faced with widespread poverty and ignorance. We are still unable to overcome forces which contribute to poor health, moral delinquency and the breaking up of family life."

In the final analysis, Loughlin concluded, everyone must go through the school of experience — and "it is from the lessons learned in this school that the world must find the solutions to its problems. And judging from the progress we have made in the Twentieth Century, I am sure we will all derive some benefits from the harsh lessons we are being taught today."

This was one example of how your officers answered all requests for speakers to talk on subjects affecting working people. Among the major events of the year there was the April 23rd Seminar entitled "After the War — Then What?" It was probably one of the most important conferences sponsored by any state council in many years. It was an effort on the part of the labor movement in Massachusetts to focus attention on a very serious problem that will have to be faced in the not-too-distant future. The problem of converting from a war-time or defense-oriented economy to a lasting peacetime economy. There had been also on March 27 the First Annual Seminar of the A. Philip Randolph Institute, at which the participants discussed long-range planning for the Seventies.

During the year we have continued to lend our efforts to such programs as our own Scholarship Program, the Harvard Trade Union Program, the National Essay Contest on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, the Union Counseling Courses conducted in cooperation with the various United Funds and Community Chests, and many others.

Vice President David McSweeney has throughout the year kept the Council thoroughly informed on all developments and problems concerning the elderly and the Massachusetts Hospital Association.

During the year three vice presidents elected at the Twelfth Annual Convention in 1969 resigned for different reasons and their places were filled by the individuals recommended by them and their respective international unions. The first was Anthony Svizzero of the IUMSWA, who became a National Representative of his international union. At his recommendation and that of IUMSWA Local 5 President Arthur Batson, Giro Cardinal was sworn in to replace him at the Council's December, 1970 meeting. At the January, 1971 meeting, Vice President Joseph F. Sweeney resigned and Michael L. Grieco was sworn in to fill the vacancy. Then in June, Vice President Edward McMahon of IUE Local 201 resigned and Bert Farnham of the same union was sworn in to replace him.

The activities of this Council during the year — up to the time this report is prepared for the printer — are more fully covered in the reports of the respective departments and standing committees, but it should be quite apparent to everyone that because of the sadly deteriorating economic condition of the country, and of the tragic helplessness or gross indifference of many whom the people have empowered to prevent these conditions, the demands upon your Council and its officers have been far greater than in normal years. We have worked hard to meet the obligations of the offices to which you have elected us and we thank you all sincerely who have cooperated with us in our efforts to make the labor movement in Massachusetts a fighting and a vital force for the good not only of the members of our affiliated unions but of all the working people of our Commonwealth.

Sincerely submitted,

SALVATORE CAMELIO, *President*

JAMES P. LOUGHLIN, *Secretary-Treasurer*

DANIEL F. MURRAY, *Executive Vice President*

JOSEPH A. SULLIVAN, *Executive Vice President*

Report of Secretary-Treasurer

*To the Officers and Delegates to the Fourteenth Annual Convention of the
Massachusetts State Labor Council, AFL-CIO*

GREETINGS:

In accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the Massachusetts State Labor Council, Section 3 of Article VI, I am submitting this annual report. In the last pages of this Book you will find the report of our auditors, the firm of Flaherty, Bliss and Company, which gives in detail the financial status of our organization at the end of fiscal year ended June 30, 1971.

You will note that once again we suffered a drop in the number of affiliated locals during the year — and at first sight it will appear that this loss of affiliates was not quite as severe as the one we had suffered in fiscal year 1969-1970. In that period we had a net loss of 46 affiliates while last year our net loss was only 13 locals.

The number of affiliates lost or gained in a fiscal year does not necessarily reflect the exact losses or gains in membership. You could lose 10 locals with 25 members each for a loss of 250 in membership and at the same time affiliate a new local with 500 members for a net gain of 250 in membership.

We have to concede, however, that our actual loss in this area this year was real. While our loss of affiliates in the 1969-1970 fiscal year was greater than this year, we had actually realized a gain in membership, as reflected in the \$22,999.93 increase in per capita income. This year, our per capita income was \$999.26 less than last year.

However, considering the continuing increase in the unemployment rate all through the year and the loss of members through an unprecedented wave of permanent plant closings — particularly in the shoe industry — I am inclined to say that we have done well and that under normal conditions we should have registered an increase in membership.

If you will look at Exhibit 2 in the Auditor's Report, you will find that our total income from all sources was \$303,486.28, or \$3586.63 less than last year. Yet, our total income this year was still \$2,486.78 more than the year previous to last year.

Last year, in my report to our Thirteenth Annual Convention, in pointing out that our net worth had increased by \$7,545.81 over the previous year, I also speculated that we might have "a not-so-bright picture" to present at this convention, for the reason that we were committed to greater financial assistance to certain candidates in the 1970 election — specifying as an instance the first class mailing of a letter on behalf of our endorsed gubernatorial candidate, the then Senate President Maurice A. Donahue, to the homes of some 200,000 of our members.


Nevertheless, considering all factors, I would say that the \$4,574.89 difference in our net worth between fiscal years 1969-1970 and 1970-1971 — a drop from \$80,763.07 to \$76,188.18 — is not unreasonable and should indicate restraint and a proper handling of the funds with which we are entrusted.

We expect, naturally, that our financial status will show us far more in the black at the end of the current fiscal year as we are now operating between elections. I would like to point out, however, that new expenses are sometimes made necessary by changing times. For instance, we are more actively involved today in voter registration than was thought necessary years ago — and with the right to vote having been extended to include the 18 to 20 year old group, no one will dispute that involvement in voter registration is one of the most essential aspects of our political activities.

We must realize that next year we will be facing perhaps the most crucial presidential election organized workers have ever had to face. Not only must we be ready to face that challenge with proper spirit, we want to make sure that we are ready financially to meet all commitments and discharge every obligation.

With this closing thought, I want to thank everyone who cooperated during the past year to help me keep our organization on a sound financial basis and who, I am sure, are as interested as I am in keeping the Massachusetts State Labor Council at the highest level of integrity, prestige and strength.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "James P. Loughlin". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name.

JAMES P. LOUGHLIN, *Secretary-Treasurer*

DEPARTMENT REPORTS

REPORT OF THE LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT

By: JAMES A. BROYER, *Director*

At the December meeting of the Council last year I was able to report that 46 bills had been filed by the Massachusetts State Labor Council for consideration by the 1971 session of the Legislature. I reported also that I had forwarded 18 of these proposals to the Research Department of the National AFL-CIO to get information as to whether or not any of the states have similar legislation in order to strengthen whatever arguments I might have to advance at hearings on these bills.

We had eighteen measures filed which had to do with the Workmen's Compensation Act and much work had already been done by the Council's Committee on Workmen's Compensation and Attorney Lawrence Locke in the preparation of these bills.

Among the other bills filed were measures relating to unemployment compensation, one of which would have made workers locked out by their employers during a labor dispute eligible for benefits. This bill was killed by the Senate in April. On this, even though we helped the Democrats win a few extra seats in the last election, we did not do as good as we did in 1970, when a similar bill was sent to the House by a 20 to 18 vote, where it was also passed and sent to the Governor for a veto.

Several others of our bills which suffered defeat included a measure to give protection to agricultural and tobacco workers; a clarification of the prevailing wage law; prevailing wages for state printing; unemployment compensation for workers idled by illness; a clarification of the unemployment compensation law to eliminate "attributable to the employing unit or its agent"; to protect professionals under the state labor relations law; to eliminate exemptions under the state wage and hour law; and to liberalize the registration of voters on primary or election days.

As this is written, however, we can only report that many of our major bills are still awaiting final action. One important bill enacted was the extension of the period of eligibility for receiving unemployment compensation from 39 to 52 weeks. This bill was passed and signed into law in mid-September.

Another bill enacted was Senate 288, which provides that if an employee has been killed or was found dead at his place of employment — or if he is physically or mentally unable to testify — it shall be conclusively presumed that the employee was performing his regular duties on the day of his injury. This is now Chapter 702 in the General Laws.

Another was Senate 103, which further increases the amount of wages and pensions which shall be exempt from attachment by trustee process. It

will take effect on January 1 of 1972. It was passed by the House on June 28 and by the Senate on June 29. It was signed by the Governor the next day to become Chapter 475.

On July 20, the House passed Senate 102, which provided for regulating the method by which a representative of organized labor is appointed to a housing authority. It was passed by the Senate on the same day and signed into law by the Governor nine days later. It is now Chapter 565.

Both the House and the Senate on July 21 passed the bill to provide for an increase in the penalty for failure to pay weekly wages to an employee. It became Chapter 590 of the General Laws when the Governor signed it on July 29.

As of this writing (it may be that final action was taken when you read this) bills still in process are:

Senate 98, which became House 5458, which would strengthen the present employment agency law by covering all employment agencies and make officers and managers individually liable for violations of the law, similar to the liability under the weekly payment of wage law. In the House Ways and Means.

Senate 294. This bill would make it possible for depositions to be taken in the doctor's office to expedite rulings by the Industrial Accident Board under Workmen's Compensation. It was on the Senate Calendar for a third reading.

Senate 296, now House 5593, is on the House Calendar at this writing.

Senate 300, which would make the chairmanship of the Industrial Accident Board co-terminous with the term in office of the Governor is on the Senate Calendar. So is Senate 301, which would empower the Board to select the insurer to pay the claim if more than one is involved. Also on the Calendar at this writing is Senate 304, which provides that arbitrary maximums under Workmen's Compensation for injured workers with permanent or partial disabilities be eliminated.

Other bills are still in either the House or Senate Ways and Means.

Besides lobbying and appearing at hearings on behalf of our legislative program, we have to make certain that we are there to prevent enactment of anti-labor bills that are filed. As early as the March meeting of the Council I reported that I had already appeared at hearings in opposition to 45 such bills — and believed at the time that least 120 more would have to be opposed.

We have to stand up also and be heard on measures which are not intended to be anti-labor but which have a direct effect on some of our unions, such as the bill which would outlaw the use of crocodile or alligator skins in the manufacture of shoes in Massachusetts. We felt that if such a law were passed by Congress and affected every state, we might not have any argument to present. But we believe that the shoe industry in Massachusetts

has already been hit hard enough and that any group desiring to prevent the extinction of crocodiles or alligators should go to Congress and not to the Massachusetts General Court.

Last year in my report I pointed out that we had done everything we could in 1970 to assist the majority in both branches of the Legislature in resisting the "tremendous pressure generated by a group of misled citizens and the Republican Administration to pave the way for cutting the size of the House from 240 to 160 members."

We believed then and we believe now that the people of Massachusetts are fortunate to have a State Constitution which gives them the "sole and exclusive right of governing themselves" and that tampering with the size of the House could make it more difficult for them to exercise that right. As pointed out in a supplement published by the Herald Traveler in February, the people of Massachusetts "have access to the law making process in a degree not equaled anywhere except in a town meeting."

The three outstanding features in Massachusetts are the right of free petition, public hearings on all bills and a requirement that all bills filed must be reported. Any citizen can file a bill and he is guaranteed that it will have a public hearing at which he can speak — and that a formal report will be made.

When you consider the workload — about 4,000 bills a session — you begin to wonder why anyone could even think of reducing the number of representatives.

This year, however, the Legislature voted overwhelmingly in favor of reducing the size of the House from 240 to 160. The proposal must now be agreed to by the 1973-74 Legislature before being placed on the ballot for voter ratification and the proposed Constitutional amendment would seat the smaller House only in 1979. So we still have time to think about it.

In Conclusion

In closing I would like to thank all those who cooperated with us by appearing at hearings when called upon to do so — and I personally want to thank the executive officers of the Council for their active participation not only at hearings but in meetings with legislators and spokesmen for the Executive Branch for discussion of important legislation.

Because the Legislature has not taken final action on some of the legislative program of the Massachusetts State Labor Council, and consequently this report to the Convention may seem rather incomplete, I want to add that as soon as the present Legislature prorogues, I will prepare a supplementary report to send to all affiliated locals which, I believe at this time, will show that we have made much progress in this 1971 session of the Massachusetts General Court.

COMMENTS ON LEGISLATION

By: AL CLIFTON, *Consultant*

As this report is written (September 1, 1971) most bills filed by the Massachusetts State Labor Council, AFL-CIO, have not reached final action at this year's session of the General Court. There is a reason for this (but that's another story), the circumstances of which will probably be more fully revealed between now and our 1971 Convention.

It is interesting to note that this year's session of the Massachusetts Legislature — as reported in the Bulletin of Committee Work and Business of the Legislature, No. 24, issued on August 23, 1971 — lists 6,118 House bills and 1,545 Senate bills, a total of 7,663 measures. Before this year's session ends, the number of bills that will have to be acted upon is almost certain to set a record. For there will be some late-filed bills admitted and, as much legislation still awaits action, there is likely to be many redrafts, based on bills covering similar subject, that will emerge with new numbers — adding to the total.

Contrast this with a session of some years ago; namely, the year 1958. When the session ended that year, there had been 3,297 House bills and 877 Senate bills filed for a total of 4,174. This year, with the session still many weeks to go, there have been over 3,489 more bills filed than there were in 1958.

I mention the foregoing because, with some changes that appear in the making, we may possibly face restrictions on the filing of bills. Such restrictions exist in some of the other states and it is not a simple matter in those states to get measures favored by labor before the Legislatures.

What this sums up to is that our unions and their members should endeavor to acquire more knowledge on how the Legislature functions, so that they can be better prepared to combat any action designed to weaken by amendment or destroy by outright repeal much of the body of laws that is beneficial not only to working men and women but which permit their unions to function.

Under the general classification of labor law we have fourteen (14) Chapters of the General Law:

Chapter 149 — Labor and Industries

Chapter 150 — Conciliation and Arbitration of Industrial Disputes

Chapter 150A — Labor Relations

Chapter 150B — Peaceful Settlement of Industrial Disputes Dangerous to Public Health and Safety

Chapter 150C — Collective Bargaining Agreement to Arbitrate

Chapter 150D — Registration of Labor Replacements or Strikebreakers

Chapter 151 — Minimum Fair Wages

Chapter 151A — Employment Security

Chapter 151B — Unlawful Discrimination Against Race, Color, Religious Creed, National Origin or Ancestry

Chapter 151C — Fair Educational Practices

Chapter 151D — Health, Welfare and Retirement Funds

Chapter 152 — Workmen's Compensation

Chapter 153 — Liability of Employers to Employees for Injuries not Resulting in Death

Chapter 154 — Assignment of Wages

Also in Chapters 212 and 214 are sections that protect unions against abuses which formerly resulted from injunctions in labor disputes. Sub-section 4 of Section 9A of Chapter 214 of the General Laws has only six lines — yet in every session employer-sponsored bills are filed to delete these six lines. One such bill filed this year simply calls for outright deletion. Another has a different approach but is designed to achieve the same end. Any lawyer versed in labor relations understands how important this Sub-section 4 of Section 9A of Chapter 214 is to unions when a labor dispute reaches an impasse and a strike or lockout takes place.

Then there is Section 30 of Chapter 212, which provides that three judges hear injunction cases in labor disputes. This section is of fairly recent origin, having been enacted on September 30, 1959, as Chapter 600 of the Acts of 1959. The importance of this Chapter is indicated by the fact that it had a special effective date of 30 days after the date of its enactment. All acts of the Legislature become effective 90 days after enactment.

Employer groups continue hoping that they will be able to so change or delete our present injunction laws as to be able once again to use the injunctive process against labor without restraint.

The Employment Security Act is Chapter 151A. The current wide spread unemployment has made substantial inroads on the Massachusetts Fund that provides the unemployment compensation checks. This Fund will have to be replenished next year and, under the law, employers will be paying under a higher schedule, which means higher taxes for this purpose. It is predicted that either Schedule C or Schedule D will go into effect. Schedule C has a range of 3.3 percent high to a low of .9 percent. Schedule D has a range of 3.5 percent high to a low of 1.1 percent. Also, these percentages of wages paid by employers will be levied on the first \$4,200 paid an employee, an increase of \$600 over the \$3,600 on which they are now paying.

What interest does labor have in these Schedules and rates that employers pay? Plenty. It must be realized that higher rates will create an incentive for employers to challenge claims in an effort to save a few dollars at the expense of the unemployed worker. It is almost certain that employer-sponsored legislation will be filed in the 1972 session to curb benefit payments by various methods — and possibly to make changes in Schedules for payments.

Both of these possibilities have to be watched by labor and particularly by the Massachusetts State Labor Council. Labor should be prepared. Possibly as a measure of precaution a bill should be filed by this Council to put into effect for a one or two-year period, or until the Fund is replenished, a higher Schedule — say Schedule F, which has a range from 3.9 percent high to a low of 1.5 percent.

The Workmen's Compensation Act is Chapter 152. The situation for injured workers today is tragic for many of them. It is definite that the Industrial Accident Board, which has to decide cases when insurance companies or self-insurers elect to challenge the claim of an injured worker, has a backlog of over 7,000 cases awaiting a hearing, some of which have been pending for many years. In the meantime the injured worker is not receiving compensation. Some who are in a position to know say that the backlog is closer to 10,000 cases. One thing appears to be clear — and that is that while insurers pay on around 85 percent of the injury cases reported without contesting the claim, they will not accept and will fight a claim if it is one that involves a serious injury.

Many reasons have been advanced for this backlog of cases but the major reason appears to be an administrative one. The responsibility lies directly with the Chairman of the Industrial Accident Board. If more help is needed for the Board to function properly he should take steps to get that help, but he has done nothing to meet the problem. Former Board Chairmen, when faced with a heavy work load, acted immediately to secure needed help and to make other changes to speed up hearings. At no time in the past has a backlog like the present one been allowed to prevail. The State Labor Council is deeply concerned about this backlog of cases and our Committee on Workmen's Compensation has devoted much time to get action in the Legislature on bills filed by the Council to correct the backlog problem.

The change in the administration of state agencies, just now going into effect, has placed the Industrial Accident Board and several other agencies under one head. This could help to correct the problem.

However, the State Labor Council is keeping a close watch on what is going on and, should it become apparent that no action is taken to reduce the backlog and provide for reasonably prompt hearings, bills will be filed for the 1972 session of the General Court to correct the situation.

There is at least one bill which, if enacted in this session, would eliminate in some degree one of the factors responsible for claims being denied. By the time you read this in Convention, the fate of that bill may be known.

The one thing an injured worker can do to protect his rights under Workmen's Compensation is to report an injury at once. An injury, however slight, can become a serious matter resulting in lost time and considerable medical expense. Failure to report before leaving work could mean a denial of the claim by the insurer. This could lead to legal expenses, a delay in getting a hearing and the possibility of the claim not being paid.

Every working man and woman has much at stake in all labor legislation. Many of the labor laws represent long years of fighting by organized labor to get relief from abuses. The same forces still exist that, year after year, seek to repeal or weaken by legislation laws that are on the statutes solely for the protection of workers.

We cannot relax in our vigilance.

REPORT OF COPE & EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

By: JOHN A. CALLAHAN, *Director*

Final tabulation of the vote cast on November 3, 1970 had shown that although the Governor's position had been retained by Governor Sargent, the results in the Massachusetts Senate showed a ratio of 30 Democrats to 10 Republicans. The results in the House of Representatives showed a ratio of 178 Democrats to 62 Republicans. Approximately 80 percent of the registered voters had participated in the election.

Prior to the election, letters of endorsement had been sent to candidates whose voting records in the past reflected their concern for the working man. Our local unions showed their concern for the success of labor's friends by setting up many programs prior to the general election. Starting early in August, a group of local union officers, aided by our office staff, conducted a pamphlet distribution in the city of Boston and in the major industrial cities throughout the state. Central labor councils and vice presidents were alerted to the necessity of establishing headquarters and setting up telephone banks throughout the state.

With the approval of the Council's executive officers, a conference was set with Congressman Brad Morse of the 5th Congressional District. Representatives from the IBEW, the CWA, Central Labor Councils and officers of the Massachusetts State Labor Council attended this meeting — and the discussion dealt with wage and price control solutions, purification of environment and other such matters. It is our hope that during the year meetings will be held in other Congressional areas throughout the state.

Starting in January of 1971 legislative meetings were held throughout the state. The first was conducted by the Greater Boston Central Labor Council at the Parker House — and many elected representatives from the area were in attendance. In Worcester a legislative meeting was held on April 2nd; in Lawrence on April 28th; in Brockton on April 14th; and in Lynn on May 12th. On the 18th of April the officers and the COPE Director sat with Al Barkan, National COPE Director, to discuss the importance of registration of our members, registration of the 18-year-olds, the Randolph Institute, in-plant registration and the possibility of having deputy registrars throughout the state.

The first phase of the Voter Identification was completed in January. We were able through this program to assemble some 150,000 names. National COPE is in the process of devising some means for a breakdown of our card system into respective cities and congressional districts.

COPE books were sent out to international unions asking for their cooperation and assistance in raising funds to support labor's friends in the forthcoming election campaign. During the year a report was compiled for National COPE on the marginal districts in Massachusetts and what one could expect and look forward to when redistricting takes place.

The National COPE cassette tape program has been concurred in by the officers of the Massachusetts State Labor Council and we hope that by use of these tapes we can keep our membership informed on important issues at the national level.

As 1972 is a year in which we will elect a President of the United States, all members of Congress, one-third of the United States Senate and all members of the Massachusetts General Court, programs must be implemented that will make possible the election of labor's endorsed friends.

Accordingly, the COPE Committee, with action concurred in by the Executive Council, is establishing a Women's Activity Committee within Massachusetts COPE. The purpose of WAD will be to achieve full participation of the female members of our trade unions in the development and in the activities of our COPE Committee.

The WAD will be an important factor in our registration and voter programs, and will participate in all related programs for the election of Labor's friends.

The recent legislation signed into law by the President of the United States lowering the voting age to 18 could add to the rolls of registered voters in Massachusetts some 330,000 names. This calls for a most concerted effort in a program to bring the "message of registration" to the 18-20-year-olds in the immediate future. It is the intent of the Massachusetts State Labor Council, working in conjunction with the League of Women Voters in Massachusetts, to make available to all interested young people brochures containing information pertaining to registration and to the great importance of the right to vote.

In addition to the above, the "Frontlash" program will be used in disseminating information about voter registration on the college campuses. "Frontlash" is the program stemming from National AFL-CIO COPE to implement a student-youth project for grassroots voter registration and political education.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Members: JOSEPH P. O'DONNELL, *Chairman*; ROSE CLAFFEY, MALCOM MCKINNON, MILTON KAPLAN, JOHN W. GRIFFIN, JAMES LAVIN, RALPH ARIVELLA, HAROLD SOUTHERLAND, GRACE STANWOOD, DANIEL WAMBOLT, ALICE CONNOLLY, ERIKA PINEAULT, JOSEPH KINNARNEY, JOHN FERNANDES, JOHN CASEY, MICHAEL RIORDAN, ISADOR PICKMAN, JOHN A. CALLAHAN, *Director*.

The Committee on Education met on December 4, 1970 at 10:00 a. m. with Chairman O'Donnell presiding.

The Director reported that \$15,000 had been pledged to the Scholarship Award Program and that the examination would be conducted in the schools on April 7, 1971. This date was arrived at by the Massachusetts Department of Education so that there would be no conflict of holidays, holy days, etc.

Final date to make application was March 18, 1971, and the names of those who were to participate would have to be received by the Massachusetts State Labor Council on or before March 26, 1971.

The Committee agreed that the "arbitration question" be deleted from the examination sheets in the contest. It was pointed out that only on one occasion in the past several years was the arbitration question a determining factor in selecting a winner. It was also determined at this time that the students should devote more time to the essay part of the program. Therefore, it is not contemplated that the arbitration question will be replaced by any other subject.

The Committee determined that each participating student should have a wider scope of subject matter in the writing of his essay and the students this year were asked to write on two or more subjects chosen from a list of seven topics.

To determine the extent of financial awards being made by trade unions in Massachusetts, the Committee had an article published in the Massachusetts State Labor Council Newsletter requesting unions engaged in scholarship programs to send all pertinent information on these programs to the Committee. It is the opinion of the Committee that a substantial amount of money is being awarded in scholarships to high schools throughout the state and that unions participating in these programs should get proper recognition.

In order to update the questions, both the matching and multiple choice, Chairman O'Donnell and Regional Director Murphy are assimilating additional questions. On December 4, 1970, Director Callahan forwarded to the AFL-CIO Department of Education a copy of our program asking their cooperation in the review of the questions in the program.

The Chairman requested that January 15, 1971, be the cut-off date for any additions or deletions to and from the question part of the program.

Considerable discussion was given to the establishment of a Speakers Bureau. Many requests have been received from schools and other segments of our society requesting speakers acquainted with the history and status of the American labor movement. If possible, we would like to have designees in the respective parts of the state, making it possible when a request is received to have somebody available in the area. Names of individuals that the Committee felt might be willing to participate were given and additional names will be added to the list as time goes on.

The Chairman suggested that when a speaker appears before a high school group that he make reference to the scholarship program and to the money made available to participating students.

Labor Institute

The Committee is of the opinion that a Labor Institute should be conducted on a biennial basis and that its duration be limited to one and a half days.

Consideration at this meeting was also given to conducting a one-day Seminar on subject matter concerning the post war economy, employment, tax plans, vocational schools, etc. Discussion of this program was continued to the next meeting, scheduled for January, when, it was hoped, more positive action could be taken on the selection of international speakers from the National Administration as well as from the National AFL-CIO.

Member Alice Connolly suggested that consideration be given to the advisability of having an alumni association of the scholarship award winners. It might be possible, she suggested, that through their cooperation and with minimum yearly dues, to establish an alumni scholarship for future winners.

At the next meeting, on January 8, kits which every high school would receive by the end of January were exhibited and distributed among the members of the Committee. The Newsletter containing the article asking unions to send in details of their scholarship programs was also distributed among the members of the Committee.

Harvard Trade Union Program

The interviews for the Harvard Trade Union Program were held on April 5, 1971. Some fifty-five trade unions have been the recipients of fellowships awarded under this program over the years and the 1970-1971 graduates were John F. Phinney, Retail Store Employees Union, Local 711, and Leonard C. Hood, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 455.

The Massachusetts State Labor Council will cooperate, as in the past, in conducting the trade union fellowship program at Harvard in the year ahead. For those of you who may not be fully informed about the program or the manner in which applications must be submitted, I submit the following:

First, there are two Fellowship Awards, the Robert J. Watt Fellowship and the Harvard Trade Union Alumni Memorial Fellowship. The first was established as a permanent yearly fellowship at the 61st Convention of the former Massachusetts Federation of Labor to perpetuate the memory of Robert J. Watt, who, as Secretary Treasurer of the Federation, had urged the establishment at Harvard University of a program for the training of trade unionists in administrative and executive fields, which eventually culminated in the establishment of the Harvard Trade Union Program. The winner of this Fellowship attends the Fall session of the program starting in September.

The second Fellowship is dedicated to the memory of outstanding leaders of the trade union movement in Massachusetts who themselves believed in training the leadership of local unions so that they, in turn, could enlighten the membership of their organizations. The winner of this Fellowship attends the Spring session, which starts in February.

The two Fellowships are equal in value and opportunity. Recipients of each fellowship receives an honorarium of \$2,500 to cover expenses of tuition, meals, books, medical and other required fees. The remainder will offset, in part, loss of wages during the 13-week classes that the fellow is in attendance at Harvard University.

The purpose of the program is to extend to trade unionists the same basic type of training for administrative responsibility which is available to men in public service or in private industry.

Subjects taught in the trade union course include: Problems in Labor Relations; Economic Analysis; Labor Law and Arbitration; Trade Union Administration, Organization and Contemporary Problems; Seminars on Negotiation and Mediation; American Labor History and International Labor Affairs; Public Speaking and Parliamentary Procedure; and Collective Bargaining Seminars.

How To Apply

(a) Applicants shall prepare a paper summarizing their background and experience in the trade union movement.

(b) Applicants must designate the manner in which they intend to apply the training received.

(c) Application must be accompanied by a letter from the President of the Local Union or Central Body in which the applicant is a member or delegate in good standing.

(d) Each applicant must appear before the Advisory Board for a personal interview. The next personal interviews will be held by the Advisory Board at a date to be established between April 3 and April 7, 1972.

As to who may apply, every trade unionist is offered the opportunity to qualify for the training offered in the fellowship program, provided that he or she is a member of a local union affiliated and in good standing with the Massachusetts State Labor Council, AFL-CIO. No specific educational qualifications are required. The University is primarily interested in having the unions send men and women of intelligence and practical experience, who are dedicated to the labor movement and who expect to spend their careers in its service.

For information relative to the course, write or call: *Joseph P. O'Donnell*, Executive Director, Harvard University Trade Union Program, Sherman Hall, Boston, Massachusetts 02163. Tel. 495-6467.

Applications must be submitted prior to March 20, 1972, and sent to the attention of *John A. Callahan*, Director, Department of COPE and Education, Massachusetts State Labor Council, AFL-CIO, 6 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass. 02108.

One-Day Seminar

At the meeting of the Committee on Education on March 19th it was agreed that participation in the Scholarship Program should be confined, as in the past, only to high schools in Massachusetts, with no exceptions.

The question of the one-day Seminar tentatively outlined at the first meeting in December was taken up again and the date of April 23 was set for the Seminar to be held at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in Boston.

Letters were sent to all vice presidents asking their help in getting the fullest possible participation from the unions in their respective areas. Much work went into the planning of the Seminar, with particular attention given to the stature and prestige of the speakers who would be invited. A letter was later sent to all affiliated unions, stressing the importance of this project and the vital need for their full participation. Committee member Pineault suggested that Chairman O'Donnell contact Rev. Mortimer J. Gavin, S. J., Director of the Catholic Labor Guild, to give the opening prayer and address the Seminar. Director Callahan would talk with Harvey Freedman at the University of Massachusetts about contacting people at the University in relation to the program. The arrangements for the Seminar were finalized at the next meeting of the Committee, held on April 12.

The Seminar, entitled "After The War — Then What?", was perhaps the most significant project sponsored by the Massachusetts State Labor Council this year. The general mood of the assembly was pretty well summed up by Father Gavin in the few words he spoke after the invocation. "I come here," he said, "like all of you, without answers but looking for them." He later wrote an excellent article on the Seminar for the Catholic Labor Guild Newsletter.

Governor Sargent could not attend. Attorney General Robert H. Quinn gave the opening address. Other speakers were President Salvatore Camelio of the Massachusetts State Labor Council; John J. Henning, Secretary-Treasurer of the California State Labor Council, AFL-CIO; George P. Delaney, Special Assistant to Secretary of State Coordinator of International Labor Affairs; Frank Pollara, Assistant Director of the AFL-CIO Department of Research; and Dean Albert J. Kelly, of Boston College, Chairman of the Massachusetts Board of Economic Advisors; and Rev. Edward F. Doyle, S. J.

Two resolutions were unanimously adopted by the Seminar, one addressed to the Congress of the United States and the other to the Massachusetts Legislature.

Congress was asked to adopt the following program: (a) A Federal Manpower Retraining Act; (b) The Kennedy Healthcare Bill; (c) Extension of the Unemployment Compensation Benefits to 52 weeks; (d) A Federal Public Works Law; (e) A massive federal program with adequate funding to attack low income housing, hospitals, education, pollution, mass transit and the ghetto problems of the cities; (f) Improved Protection for the Consumer; (g) A Federal Minimum Wage of \$2.00 per hour; (h) Quota Systems Against Low Wage Countries Which Have Their Own Protective Laws Against Our Exports; and (i) The National AFL-CIO Program for Expansion of Our Economy.

The Massachusetts General Court was urged to adopt the following program: (1) That Unemployment Benefits Be Increased to 60% of the Average Wage and Be Extended to 52 Weeks; (2) Strengthening of our Employment Agency Law to Protect Unemployed Persons from the Unscrupulous Agencies; (3) Better Protection for the Injured Worker by Increasing the Benefits and Expediting the Long-Delayed Cases; (4) Increased Funds for Retraining of Employees and Vocational Training; (5) Creation of a Committee to Develop State Programs to Help Us in the Transitive Period.

Scholarship Program

Examinations in the scholarship contest were held on April 7, 1971. Some 4,000 high school seniors in over 300 high schools throughout the state took the examinations in the contest.

As in the past, the value of the Essay Question, which is the most important part of the examination, was 40 points. The value of the Matching Question and the Multiple Choice Question, because of the elimination of the Arbitration Question, was increased from 20 points to 30 points each.

On the Essay Question the participants were given a choice of five topics — political action and legislation, education, civil rights, community services and international affairs — and asked to summarize in 1,500 words or less their evaluation of labor's impact in the areas of the one or two topics selected by them from the list. The question was prefaced with a statement that American labor has always been in the forefront in programs beneficial to the citizens of our country and that although some segments of our society disagree with labor's approach to current issues "the Massachusetts State Labor Council welcomes your open and honest opinions on your selection from the topics listed."

Winners of the five top awards in the 1971 Scholarship Program were:

John F. Kennedy Award, \$1,000 — Nan Freeman of Wakefield Memorial High School.

Francis E. Lavigne Memorial Award, \$1,000 — Ann Biglin of Holyoke Catholic High School.

Mass. State Labor Council Award, \$500, and Brockton Central Labor Council Award, \$500 — Jean Marie Kelly of Whitman, Hanson Regional High School.

Mass. State Conference of Bricklayers, Masons and Plasterers Award, \$1,000, and Framingham Central Labor Council Award, \$100 — Bruce Gerald Cassidy of Westwood, Xaverian Brothers High School.

Laborers International Union of North America, Salvatore Pavone Award, \$500 — William Faranda of Waltham High School.

The total amount awarded in scholarships this year reached \$18,000.

The judges of the contest were Rev. Mortimer Gavin, S. J., Director of the Catholic Labor Guild; Prof. Joseph P. O'Donnell, Director of the Harvard Trade Union Program; Mass. AFL-CIO Executive Vice President Joseph A. Sullivan; AFL-CIO Regional Director Franklin J. Murphy; and Jasper Grassa of the Massachusetts Federation of Teachers.

Conclusion

The Committee on Education held another meeting on July 12 at which proposed courses at the University of Massachusetts in Boston were discussed and a recommendation was made that research be done in the fields of imports, air pollution, housing and pensions.

It was also agreed at this meeting that a Labor Institute be held on May 5 and 6 of 1972. Chairman O'Donnell suggested "Critical Issues" as a theme.

Director Callahan discussed the choosing of speakers to address a Guidance Counselors-Union Representatives Nite which will be held at Suffolk University on November 9, 1971. This program is the first such Seminar to be conducted by the Massachusetts State Labor Council with guidance counselors and union representatives participation.

Other meetings during the year which necessitated participation by your Director of COPE and Education were held by the Textile Workers Union of America, the Pioneer Valley Central Labor Council, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the Philip Randolph Institute, the United Papermakers and Paperworkers, the Industrial Union Department of Massachusetts, the Massachusetts Building and Construction Trades, the Norfolk Scholarship Award Nite, and the Brockton Educational Nite.

The Office of Regional Director Franklin J. Murphy and his staff have cooperated in a most favorable manner with the COPE and Education Department and Ruth Columbo of WAD and Area COPE Director Henry Murray are to be commended for their willingness to cooperate at all times in carrying out COPE activities in Massachusetts.

I want to express my sincere appreciation also to the officers of the Council, the directors of the respective departments and the entire office staff for the assistance they gave me in carrying out the duties incumbent upon me.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC RELATIONS

By: GERARD KABLE, *Director*

Since January of 1969 the Newsletter, official publication of the Massachusetts State Labor Council has been issued regularly on a monthly basis and its circulation has been increased to include all officers and active members of affiliated local unions. While we know that the majority of the people we are supposed to reach are already on our mailing list, we feel that those who are not on that list should send in their names and home addresses so that we may add possibly several hundred more to our present circulation.

While the news media today is much more inclined to report the activities of the labor movement or the pronouncements of its elected officials with a higher measure of fullness and fairness than it was in the Thirties and Forties — when the movement was still in the throes of growing pains — we cannot expect, for instance, that labor's position will be given proper — or even fair — editorial treatment in the newspapers if that position is seriously in conflict with that of big business, whose advertising money it is that keeps newspapers alive.

Therefore, we still have to lean heavily on the labor press to get the full message across — at least to our members.

Earlier this year a two-day seminar was held in North Miami, Florida, at which labor reporters of the daily press had a chance to hear the gripes of union heads about the treatment of labor activities by the news media.

The newsmen, mostly fulltime labor reporters, urged more openness in the bargaining process, including fuller briefings and more details about what goes on in negotiations behind closed doors.

AFL-CIO officials said that their biggest complaint was that some newspapers assign untrained reporters to cover complex labor bargaining. They pointed out also that newspapers are mostly inclined to headline strikes while ignoring other labor matters. The AFL-CIO's social goals, said AFL-CIO Secretary-Treasurer Lane Kirkland, such as lobbying for Social Security, national health insurance and civil rights laws gets very little attention in the news media.

Jerry Wurf, president of the AFSC&ME, said there weren't enough full-time labor reporters in the nation. To which Neil Gilbride, labor reporter for the Associated Press and president of the Wire Service Guild, and others replied that a seminar for editors and publishers should be held to pursue that point.

It is true that most of the working force on daily newspapers are themselves members of trade unions. The typos and the pressmen were trade unionists long before the advent of the CIO and Heywood Broun's successful efforts to get those who write the news organized (We often wonder how a good union typo must have felt when he was assigned to set up the venom spewed forth by characters such as the late, unlamented Westbrook Pegler?)

There is no question that most of the people who work in the Pie Alleys of the nation today have a close affinity with trade unionists in all other industries. They practically all have to negotiate union contracts. But reporters and rewrite men and women have to work within the confines of the editorial policies of the newspapers for which they work — and many good reporters have been condemned for the sins of their editors or publishers.

The labor press remains the best source of accurate labor news for trade unionists. It must continue to expand.

So, in closing, I want to urge every officer and active member of any local union represented by delegates to this Convention, if he or she has not yet done so, to send their names and home addresses to be placed on our Newsletter mailing list.

LABOR LAW DEVELOPMENTS DURING PAST YEAR

By: ROBERT M. SEGAL, *Counsel*

1. Introduction

During the past year, federal developments again dominated the labor law field. The U. S. Supreme Court handed down several important decisions under the Taft-Hartley Law and two under the Landrum Griffin Law. In Massachusetts, the Supreme Judicial Court dealt with labor relations matters in four cases.

2. U. S. Supreme Court

In *NLRB v. Local 825 Operating Engineers (Burns & Roe, Inc.)* 400 U.S. 297 (1971), The Court held that a union violated Section 8(b) (4) (B) of the federal labor law when it "struck" neutral employers to force primary employers to change a policy on job assignment. The Court held that it is not necessary to prove a *total* cessation of business between the neutral and primary employers for a violation of the secondary-boycott provisions.

The Court affirmed the decision below that the NLRB, in deciding a refusal to bargain charge against an employer, may use the regional director's determination that the bargaining unit was appropriate rather than make its own independent finding (*Magnesium Casting Co. v. NLRB*, 401 U.S. 137, 1971).

The line between a state court's and the NLRB's jurisdiction was further delineated in *Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees v. Lockridge*, 77 LRRM 2501 (1971). Here the union had procured a member's discharge under a union security clause for his failure to pay required dues on time. A decision in the state court for restoration of union membership and damages for the alleged wrongful suspension which resulted in his discharge was reversed by a 5 to 4 decision in the U.S. Supreme Court on the ground of federal preemption.

Two major opinions dealt with internal affairs of unions. In *Boilermakers v. Hardeman*, 76 LRRM 2542 (Feb. 24, 1971) a union member assaulted the Business Manager of the local for allegedly failing to refer him for a job; he was tried on charges of creating dissension, which carried a penalty of expulsion, and threatening and using force to restraining an officer in discharging his duties, which carried a punishment "as warranted by the offense." He was found "guilty as charged" and expelled for an indefinite period. The Supreme Court upheld the union tribunal and stated that courts had no authority to substitute their interpretations of union regulations to determine the scope of offenses warranting discipline or, indeed, whether particular conduct may be punished at all. It also held that the charging party need only present "some evidence" at the disciplinary hearing to support the charges.

In *Hodgson v. Local 6799 Steelworkers*, 77 LRRM 2497 (June, 1971), the Court held that Section 401(e) of the Landrum Griffin Law requires that a member must first exhaust his internal union remedies concerning his protest of the alleged violation of the Act under the union's by-laws or constitu-

tion before the Secretary of Labor may set aside an election because of the alleged violation. However, the Court warned unions that it will impose a heavy burden on them to show that they could not in any way discover that a member was complaining of the violation in issue. The question of whether meeting attendance requirements to be eligible for office were "reasonable qualifications uniformly imposed" was never reached by the Court. At the same time, the case does not limit the U. S. Secretary of Labor's power to investigate election complaints.

In *California Dept. of Human Resources Development v. Java*, 91 S.Ct. 1347, the Court held that suspension of unemployment compensation benefits pending review on challenge by the employer does not meet the requirements of the Social Security Act. The Court made a detailed analysis of the operation and purposes of the unemployment insurance program and concluded that the California scheme which automatically stopped payments pending appeal did not meet the requirement of Section 303 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act which requires that state methods of administration must be "reasonably calculated to insure full payment of unemployment compensation when due."

Of special interest to labor unions is the decision in *United Transportation Union v. State Bar of Michigan*, 401 U. S. 576 (1971) where the Court held the First Amendment guaranteeing freedom of speech, petition and assembly gives railroad workers the right to cooperate in helping and advising one another in asserting their rights under the F.E.L.A. In this case, the union recommended selected attorneys to its members and their families and obtained a commitment from the attorneys that they would not charge more than 25% of the recovery.

3. Massachusetts Decisions

In *G & M Employment Service v. Commonwealth*, 1970 Adv. Sheets 153, 265 N.E. 2d 476 (December 17, 1970), employment agencies sought to test the constitutionality of a statute, filed by the Mass. State Labor Council, regulating such agencies, particularly the inclusion of a maximum fee to be charged applicants. (Chapter 896 of the Acts of 1967 amending G.L. c.140, sub-paragraphs 46A to 46R). The Court found that the agencies did not present adequate evidence to show that the application of maximum rates was confiscatory. It therefore entered a final decree declaring the regulation of the agencies to be constitutional.

In *McCormack v. Labor Relations Commission*, 1971 Adv. Sheets 157, 266 N.E. 2d 651 (February 10, 1971) the Court dismissed an attempt of a labor organization to intervene to review a certification of the Labor Relations Commission. It reasoned that, since a labor organization is a voluntary unincorporated association, it is not a separate legal entity. Suits brought by and against such associations must be done in the name of individuals who are alleged to be and are fairly representative of the "class" composed of all the members. The Court applied this principle to intervention and, since the intervention was brought in the name of the union and not in the name of individuals representing the "class," it found that the intervenor's appeal should have been dismissed.

In *Labor Relations Commission v. University Hospital, Inc.*, 1971 Adv. Sheets 861, 269 N.E. 2d 682 (May 13, 1971) the hospital had appealed a superior court's decree enforcing the Commission's order requiring the hospital to bargain upon request with the certified collective bargaining representative. In superior court the hospital raised two objections which were the subject of appeal. The first dealt with the finding of the Commission that the skilled tradesmen sought in the Union's Petition was an appropriate unit; the Court found this objection to be without merit since there was substantial evidence to adequately support the commission's conclusion. The second concerned itself with the alleged "unduly short time" between the order for holding the election and the election itself. The Court found no merit to the objection since the hospital had enough time to send out three letters to each employee and even held a meeting with all eligible voters.

In *Sheahan Jr. v. School Committee of Worcester*, 270 NE 2d 912 (June 22, 1971), the Court held that an arbitration agreement signed by the chairman of the school committee without any majority vote of the seven member committee was not binding and the Court refused to confirm the arbitration award made by the state board of conciliation and arbitration involving a controversy with the collective bargaining representative for the public school teachers of Worcester. The Court also narrowly construed the grievance and arbitration section of the labor contract.

4. State Legislation

As of the date of this report, the Legislature has not passed any major labor bills but is still considering several important labor measures filed by the Mass. State Labor Council, AFL-CIO. These include improved benefits and liberalization under the unemployment and workmen's compensation laws, and strengthening the employment agency law in Massachusetts. At the same time, the following important bills filed by the Mass. State Labor Council have again been defeated; unemployment compensation benefits for persons out of work as a result of a lockout, clarification of the unemployment compensation law to eliminate "attributable to the employing unit or its agent," protection of agricultural and tobacco workers, protection of professionals under the state labor relation laws, elimination of exemptions under the state wage and hour law, clarification of the prevailing wage law, prevailing wages for state printing, benefits for persons out of work as a result of illness, and liberalized registration of voters on primary or election days.

5. Conclusion

Although the federal field dominates the labor law field, several new developments are important on a state level. These include the continuing importance of municipal labor relations and the need for improved legislation, especially in the minimum wage and workmen's and unemployment compensation fields. On a federal level, the Court has granted review for next term to the questions whether retirees are "employees" for bargaining purposes under the Taft-Hartley Law and whether the NLRB erred in holding a jurisdictional dispute hearing where the two unions but not the employer

agreed to be bound by the National Joint Board for the Settlement of Jurisdictional Disputes.

During the past year, your counsel was occupied with drafting legislative bills, preparing legal memoranda for your officers and Executive Council, preparing legal articles and appearing at various legal meetings concerning labor relations law. The rapid developments in the field of labor relations should command the attention of all labor leaders and their members.

SPECIAL REPORT

(The following is a brief analysis of President Nixon's 90-day wage freeze prepared for this convention by the Council's legal counsel, Robert M. Segal.)

1. General

On August 15, 1971, President Nixon by Executive Order froze wages and salaries along with rents and most prices for a period of 90 days. The Order is administered through the President's Cost of Living Council and carries a \$5,000 fine and/or injunctions for violations.

During the 90-day period wage increases are not allowed above the wages in effect on August 14, 1971, although there are a few exceptions. The freeze applies to public as well as private employees and also applies to all fringe benefits. Even dues by labor unions cannot be increased during the freeze period.

This report attempts to highlight some of the wage freeze ruling issued by the Cost of Living Council up to September 15, 1971.

2. Which Wages Are Frozen During 90-Day Period

Based on various rulings by the Cost of Living Council, the following wage increases are frozen during the 90-day period:

(a) Deferred wage and fringe increases which have been negotiated in the past but are to take effect during the 90-day freeze. *Example:* A contract negotiated last year providing for a 30 cents per hour increase on September 1, 1971.

(b) Cost of Living adjustments in freeze period. *Example:* A contract providing for a Cost of Living adjustment on October 1, 1971.

(c) Longevity pay increase due in freeze period. *Example:* A five dollar raise every six months based on length of service coming due between August 15 and November 14, 1971.

(d) Additional fringe benefits effective during the freeze period. *Example:* I. The old contract provides that Columbus Day or Armistice Day will be an additional paid holiday in 1971. II. The new contract gives more vacations, sick leave or other fringes during the freeze period.

(e) Wage and fringe increases in contracts negotiated or ratified after August 14, 1971.

(f) Merit raises during the freeze period.

(g) Reduced work day or work week at same pay during the freeze period. *Example:* I. A reduction from 8 to 7½ hours in the work day or from 42 to 40 hours in the work week at the same pay as for 8 and 42 hours respectively. II. Premium pay after 7½ hours instead of after 8 hours in a day.

(h) Increases in shift differentials. *Example:* The introduction of a new 30 cents per hour premium for the second shift which, prior to the freeze, did not have the 30 cents differential.

(i) New job rates. Scales are determined on the basis of comparable firms available; if not, in nearby firms; and cannot be increased.

3. Which Wage Increases Are Permitted During Freeze Period

The following wage adjustments can be made during the 90-day freeze period:

(a) Wage adjustments negotiated and effective prior to August 15, 1971 but which were not put into effect prior to August 15, 1971. *Example:* I. If the old contract ran out prior to August 15, 1971 and a new contract was negotiated by the parties prior to August 15, 1971 with the wage increases to be effective prior to August 15, 1971, the new wage scale can be put into effect retroactive to the termination date of the old contract and these new rates apply during the freeze period; any increases effective only during the freeze period cannot be put into effect. II. A contract ran out on July 1, 1971 and the union and the company negotiated and agreed on terms for a new contract prior to August 15, 1971 with a retroactive wage increase of 25 cents per hour to July 1. The 25 cents per hour increase can be put into effect and retroactivity can be paid. This is true even though the contract was not formally signed by the employer before August 15 — as long as it was agreed upon by the parties and ratified by the union prior to August 15, 1971.

(b) Promotions. Bona fide promotions which constitute an advancement to an established job with greater responsibility are allowed and the rate of the new job can be paid.

(c) Apprentices and learners and probationary rates. Increases to apprentices and learners are permitted under programs established prior to August 15, 1971. *Example:* I. An apprentice who becomes a journeyman under an apprenticeship program is entitled to the journeymen's rate during the freeze. II. A contract provides for a 60-day probationary period which runs out on October 1; on that date the employee is entitled to the regular rate of the job if he has passed his probationary period.

(d) Cost of Living adjustments due prior to August 15. *Example:* If the contract provided for a semi-annual Cost of Living increase on August 1, 1971 which was not put into effect because of waiting for publication of the Consumer Price Index, the increase can now be put into effect retroactive to August 1, for the employees who were working at (but not receiving) the increased rate prior to the freeze.

(e) Transfers from a flat rate to an incentive rate job, provided the incentive rate was in effect prior to the freeze.

(f) Increased pension benefits previously planned or scheduled are permitted during the freeze because they are not considered payments for services rendered.

(g) The wages of employees on piece rates are not frozen but there can be no increase in the base piece rate. The wage rates set prior to the freeze for a new or changed job may, however, be increased and paid retroactively, provided a grievance was filed prior to August 15 under the grievance procedure.

(h) Severance payments under plans or procedures established prior to August 15.

(i) Increases in pay dependent on employees completing educational requirements for specific job levels.

(j) Increases necessary to correct wage practices which are illegal under the fair employment statutes.

(k) Veterans returning to work during the freeze are allowed to be paid the current rate on their jobs even though this is an increase over the rate they were getting when they left for the service.

(l) Wage increases for workers whose wages are closely tied to increases for other workers in the same firm that were negotiated prior to the freeze are allowed under specified conditions.

(m) Retroactive payments for the period from the end of the old contract to August 15 under certain conditions described under "Collective Bargaining" below.

4. What About Collective Bargaining in the 90-Day Freeze

The law does not prohibit collective bargaining during the 90-day freeze period. Many international unions have already sent out guidelines for their locals, suggesting legal clauses to use in negotiations during the freeze period. Some have suggested the filing of grievances on deferred wage increases which have not been granted under an existing contract during the freeze.

Contracts currently under negotiation can also provide for retroactive payments to the end of the old contract but without the new increases to be paid for work done after August 15 if there has been a past practice of retroactivity and if the parties demonstrate that they did not change their position during negotiations to compensate or absorb the impact of the freeze.

Example: Under a contract agreed upon October 1, 1971 but effective July 1, increasing a wage rate from \$2.80 to \$3.00, the employees can receive \$3.00 per hour from July 1 through August 15 but only \$2.80 per hour from August 16 to the end of the freeze.

5. How Can You Obtain Rulings on the Wage Freeze

By writing, with supporting data, to the Office of Emergency Preparedness in the Department of the Treasury, P. O. Box 9084, JFK Post Office, Boston, Mass. — or by going to the JFK Building, Rooms E-100 or E-121, in Boston. You can also call them at the JFK Building.

General rulings based on the Stabilization Program Guidelines can be obtained on specific wage increases. Information can also be obtained from your international union.

6. What Happens Next?

Phase 2 of the program will deal with the problem of wage increases after the 90 day freeze in November and may also deal with the deferred wage increases during the freeze period. In addition, the AFL-CIO and many international unions will soon send out guidelines to assist their locals on the freeze and Phase 2.

**STANDING
COMMITTEE
REPORTS**

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

Members: JOSEPH A. SULLIVAN, *Chairman*; FRANCES QUINN, PHILIP SALEM, GEORGE CARIGNAN, RICHARD B. O'KEEFE, JESSE DRUCKER, HOWARD DOYLE, LOUIS GOVONI, JOHN BARRON, GUY CAMPOBASSO, LUBERT TAYLOR, MATTHEW RYAN, VALENTINE MURPHY, JOSEPH MCCARTHY, DONALD A. SHAW, JOHN SILVA, CHARLES WARREN, *Secretary*.

During the campaign to elect a Governor and a 280 member General Court last year the subject of taxes was pretty generally avoided by the candidates. Taxes are always an unsavory topic for any candidate seeking public office — more so if the office you are seeking is that of the Governorship. But the last ballot had barely been checked when the general public was suddenly told that they would have to pay more taxes and that much more additional revenue would be needed to keep the Commonwealth from going bankrupt.

To keep the general public from running amok at the news, it was simultaneously announced that a Special Commission to Develop a Master Plan and Program for Taxation Within the Commonwealth — created by Chapter 162 of the Resolves of 1967 and revived and continued by Chapter 3 of the Resolves of 1969 after a coma of more than two years — was finally going to submit its Master Plan to the Governor and to the Legislature.

On November 25 of 1970, members of this Committee and the Executive officers of the Council sat down with members of the Special Commission to discuss a tentative plan they had prepared upon which the final draft of a Master Plan would be drawn for submission to the Legislature as a basis for 1971 tax proposals. Representing the Special Commission were Senator George V. Kenneally, Jr., Chairman of the Commission; Rep. Frederick W. Schlosstein, a member; and Robert H. McClain, Jr., Executive Director of the Commission.

We were shown that 54% of the total tax burden comes from property taxes — and that the next biggest yield, 16%, is from personal income taxes. Another 14% comes from consumer and transaction taxes, the sales tax. The other three general sources of revenue are business taxes, 9%; miscellaneous taxes, 2%; and non-tax revenue, 5%. The main attraction of this tentative plan was the proposition that property taxes should never yield more than 42% of the total tax collections in any fiscal year.

We understood, of course, that if the plan before us were used as a base for future tax programs, it would not necessarily mean lower taxes, even for the homeowner. The tax burden would always depend on projected budgets, whether advanced by the state or by cities and towns. If the budget of a city, for instance, jumped from \$200 million to \$500 million, even under the 42% formula the homeowner would have to pay more in property tax. But the aim was to bring some sort of relief to the unquestionably overburdened property owner.

The Master Plan would be an attempt at reform by redistribution of the tax burden to make it more equitable. But if the redistribution meant that only personal income taxes and the sales tax were to be increased to fill the gap left by a reduction of property taxes that certainly would be no reform at all. President Camello brought the fact that no mention of taxes on rental income was made in the proposals of the Commission. And this Committee, as well as the officers of the Council, made it clear that labor would never go along with any increase in the sales tax.

We don't have to review in detail here the see-saw battle that took place on Beacon Hill between the Executive and the Legislative branches of our state government from January to the passage of a tax measure designed to cover a projected budget of nearly \$2 billion. The advances and retreats in the battle lasted long enough to confuse everyone until the battle was hopelessly lost by the taxpayers.

On May 10 of this year your Committee met again — this time to have a tax measure proposed by the Governor — House No. 5412 — explained to us by Mr. Charles Shepard, State Commission of Administration. He told us that the first tax plan was based on the outline recommended by the Special Tax Commission but that the interim plan was primarily based on expanding the basis of the income tax and the sales tax. We felt that the plan hit hard at the consumer without touching special interest groups.

The tax increases for 1971 have been enacted. We know that the most attractive feature of the so-called Master Tax Plan — that which would at least have curbed the power to single out the property owner as the prime victim — was completely ignored. Property taxes are soaring everywhere and there appears to be no relief in sight. The only consolation we have is that the Senate had the sense to reject a House-passed proposal to increase the sales tax.

Taxes, of course, are here to stay. And the need for new taxes will continue as long as the general public clamors for new and improved services from the towns, the cities and the state. There is no question that we need more and better educational facilities, more and abler police protection, more and less confusing public transportation, more and cleaner parks and other recreational facilities, and certainly a better welfare system to take care of the poor and the indigent elderly.

It is not, however, merely a question of the need for additional revenue. The principal question is where is the saturation point up to which you can pile on taxes on those who are the least able to pay. The real need is for drastic tax reforms. The tax structure under the Constitution of Massachusetts is probably as outmoded as the Kitty Hawk as compared to Apollo 14. It is an overhauling of the structure that we need first. And that is what this Committee will continue to study in order to come up with recommendations to the Council. We would like to see a taxation program that hits individuals and corporations or other vested interests with equal impact. That is our only objective.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES

Members: HELEN T. O'DONNELL, *Chairman*; HELEN CHATTERTON, ARTHUR DIPETRO, WILLIAM KELLEY, KENNETH MANGAN, JAMES MONACO, C. THERESA LOCKE, JOHN MULLEN, JOHN O'CONNOR, FRANK PRIOLI, SAMUEL WALKER, FRANCIS FINEGAN, FRANK BRODERICK, MARTIN JOYCE, LEO WALLACE, HAROLD G. TERRY, BERRY ARONSON, JOSEPH D. McLAUGHLIN, *Secretary*.

The second meeting of the Committee was held on February 24, 1971. The first order of business at this meeting was the discussion of a letter from the New Bedford and Cape Cod Labor Council regarding the naming of a new labor representative on the New Bedford United Fund to fill the vacancy left by the resignation of Emil Bellotti, who had up to January 29 served for seventeen years as Director of the Community Services Committee of the Greater New Bedford Council and as labor representative on the New Bedford United Fund.

In his letter of resignation addressed to the Massachusetts State Labor Council, Mr. Bellotti expressed some thoughts which might well reflect the inner feelings of many who serve in a capacity similar to that in which he served so diligently and so well for seventeen years.

"In reviewing my work," he wrote, "I find periods of despair, frustration and, actually, desolation caused primarily by myopic, selfish, insecure individuals whose sense of service embraces only the little 'kingdom' they've inherited and protect dastardly from imaginary perils with arrogant disregard for the well-being of others.

"However, there are many fertile spots in my humble career where the services performed brought joy, contentment and tranquility to all those who sought my help. And the hundreds of unsolicited letters of thanks I received will help me maintain the proper equilibrium toward that element whose concept of equity is based on selfish negative thinking brought upon by the miniscule mind they possess."

Decisive action on the request of the New Bedford Council was deferred until April but it was agreed that the Committee would recommend to the Massachusetts State Labor Council that "a strong position be taken in support of the New Bedford Labor Council in regard to the continuation of a full-time labor representative on the New Bedford United Fund."

Member John Mullen also brought the Committee up to date on the merger of the Greater Lowell and Greater Lawrence-Haverhill United Funds to create an organization now known as the Merrimac Valley United Fund.

Other matters taken up were the suggestion that a state or New England conference be sponsored by the State Labor Council to discuss strike assistance programs and a communication from the Mental Health, Inc., asking for labor participation on an in-depth tour of mental hospitals for the purpose of making suggestions or criticisms on operation and treatment. It was agreed that we would participate.

The first meeting of this Committee had been held on November 10, 1970, at which time most of the business at hand was the United Fund Fund-Raising Campaign, which was falling short of its goal and which had to be extended to December 16, 1970.

On March 21st, our Chairman, Mrs. Helen T. O'Donnell, represented the Massachusetts State Labor Council at the 1971 AFL-CIO Biennial Regional Community Services Training Conference held at the University of Miami in Florida.

On March 16 member John O'Connor of this Committee participated at a meeting of the Legislative Committee of the Regional Child Care Committee to discuss several bills pertaining to child care then pending before the Legislature. This was taken up at one of our subsequent meetings, which were held on June 23 and on August 23. At these meetings, important subjects such as the high cost of medical assistance under the Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare and the work of the Urban Education Fund, established on July 31 of 1970 as a non-profit organization to raise money to support self-help programs generated by the black community.

As of now, this Committee is deeply committed to help make the 1971-1972 fund-raising campaign of the Massachusetts Bay United Fund and other Funds and Chests throughout the State smashing successes. In a letter to all affiliate locals, signed by President Camelio and our Committee Secretary Joseph D. McLaughlin, it is pointed out that "this year, with so many of our brothers and sisters unemployed, the burden will now fall upon the ones who are employed. This means we must give more than we did in previous years for this worthy cause."

In closing this Report we want to thank everyone who has cooperated with us to make our work easier and to say that we feel that more and more people have come to realize the importance of serving the community. The problem generated by slums, poverty, drug abuse, and lack of proper educational and recreational facilities will not be solved unless there are enough people who are willing to give of their energy and of their time to help.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Members: EDWARD McMAHON, *Chairman*; ELDRIDGE BUFFUM, HERMAN GREENBERG, EDWARD WALL, SAM WASSERMAN, JIM DeBOW (*Deceased*), ELLIOT KLITZMAN, FRED JONES, JOHN REILLY, MARY STEFANI, JAMES REILLY, JOHN BURNS, GENE SPINELLO, JOHN BRENNAN, REXFORD WENG, JULIUS BERNSTEIN, *Secretary*.

During the last year the Committee on Civil Rights noted that interest and concern with the issue of civil rights had gone past its peak in the labor movement just as it had in the rest of the nation. Although we were still involved in a number of activities, we did find less contact from our constituency in the way of requests for either educational programs or aid.

However, our Committee did present programs on the themes of "solidarity and brotherhood" and distribute literature at institutes of the United Steelworkers, the ILGWU and the Maine State Federated Labor Council. In addition, since ours is the only trade union civil rights committee with a full time person available, we accepted assignments to furnish literature and a guest speaker on a civil rights theme at the conventions of the New Hampshire, Vermont and Rhode Island AFL-CIO Councils.

In the area of legislation, our prime effort on the state level was in behalf of a bill to make available bilingual transitional education. Such a move is important because of the large Spanish-speaking population that has emigrated to Massachusetts in the past few years. Unfortunately, at this writing, the bill has not yet been passed. On the national level, our prime legislative efforts were for the bill to strengthen the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission by granting it cease and desist powers. Last year Congressman Colmer bottled it up in Committee. This year we are hopeful that it will be acted upon when the Congress comes back into session.

Another piece of national legislation of concern to us was the "Manpower Bill" that was passed but vetoed by President Nixon. This bill had important implications for minority groups, among whom the unemployment is very high. We are pleased, however, to note that the Congress did pass a "Public Service Employment Bill" which was strongly supported by the AFL-CIO and to which we added our support on the state level.

It should also be noted that at the last several conventions the State Labor Council has called for Senate ratification of the Genocide Treaty. Our Committee has been active in trying to mobilize pressure in that regard, and we are happy to be able to report that after over twenty years, the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee has pulled the Treaty to outlaw the mass murder of human beings out of the pigeonhole. The Treaty has received a favorable report and should soon be on the Senate floor.

Our Committee also worked closely during the past year with our black trade union brothers who are organized in the A. Philip Randolph Institute. We aided them in developing and conducting their register and vote drives within the black community. In addition, we were represented at the regional conference held in Connecticut to map their program in New England for the coming year. Lastly, our Committee aided in planning the civil rights seminar conducted by the Randolph Institute at M.I.T., and some of our Committee members led sessions.

At this point, it is appropriate to pause and note the loss suffered this year by our Committee when Jim Debow, Chairman of the Randolph Institute in Boston and Steelworkers representative, was killed in an unfortunate accident. His calm and steadying influence and his knowledge of his own black community will be sorely missed.

Our Committee also continued to represent organized labor on the Massachusetts Advisory Committee of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. We were able to make a particular contribution in regard to three of the special projects of the SAC.

In New Bedford closed meetings were held on the issue of police-community relations because of the acute tensions existing between the police and the black and Cape Verdean community. We also took part in a four-day study of the effect of suburban housing and industrial development on the employment situation of inner city minority groups. Lastly, we participated in three days of open meetings in relation to the acute employment, housing and education problems of the Spanish-speaking communities in Boston and Springfield. In all of these sessions the interests of labor emerged at some point, and our representative was able to present and defend our views and role.

As in the past, the Civil Rights Committee also worked with a number of organizations functioning in the civil rights field. These included such groups as the Apprenticeship Information Center, the Massachusetts Conference on Human Rights and the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination. There were a number of other such groups in which we represented labor and civil rights interests, but these were the most important.

In connection with this brief report, here are just a very few other programs in which we participated that we would like to mention. Since a number of Internationals are affiliated with the program for "Shaping Safer Cities," we participated during the past year in the organization of such a group in Boston. Also, at the request of the Jewish Labor Committee, we supported our brother trade unionists in their effort to convince the Boston Mayor's Office of Human Rights that they should be involving themselves not only with discrimination on account of race, color and national origin, but also with discrimination on account of religion.

In addition, because of our contacts with the minority community, our Committee undertook during the past year to win support in those areas for the United Farm Workers Boycott Campaigns, and to win support for the AFL-CIO's national health security program.

Looking back on the year, our Committee is disappointed in the fall-off of broad activity by organized labor with civil rights issues, although there is no question of continuing concern and commitment. It would appear a period of apathy is setting in and, therefore, we urge increased attention and activity during the coming year because this is just one phase of the total concern of the labor movement with winning social justice and equality for all workers.

In closing, the Civil Rights Committee wishes to extend thanks for their aid and cooperation to the Officers, Departments and staff of the State Labor Council, as well as the Civil Rights Department, AFL-CIO, in Washington. Thanks also to the locals and members who cooperated with us during the year. We wish also to express special thanks and appreciation to our trade union brothers and sisters of the Jewish Labor Committee for the generosity of their National Trade Union Council for Human Rights for making available to our Committee, on a full-time basis, the services of a trade union civil rights specialist to carry on and direct our work. His presence also enabled us to maintain ties and lines to the civil rights movement and its supporters, as well as to service our locals and our sister Councils in New England on civil rights matters.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Members: RONALD ORCUTT, *Chairman*; ARTHUR OSBORNE, STEVE LAZAR, JOE BONIVITA, OSCAR PRATT, JOHN CRAIG, ARTHUR CECELSKI, BERT FARNHAM, JOHN O'BRIEN, LOUIS POIRIER, JOHN PRENDERGAST, VINCENT MCKINNA, MATTEO CIUFFREDO, SAUL WALLACE, HAROLD HIRTLE, NICHOLAS MAGLIANO, PAUL MELODY, THOMAS BOWE, ALFORD DYSON, *Secretary*. ATTORNEY LAWRENCE LOCKE, *Ex Officio*.

This Committee probably had the busiest year it ever had — and undoubtedly the busiest it will have for some time. The reason is that the Massachusetts State Labor Council — after trying for many years to find some effective way of getting quick and fair settlements in cases affecting injured workers, even to the extent of going all out to add more members on the Industrial Accident Board for longer terms and at higher pay some years back — got fed up with the maneuvering of underwriters of Workmen's Compensation insurance which has led to a backlog of more than 7,000 cases waiting to be heard by the Industrial Accident Board, some for two or three years, and filed for consideration by the 1971 Legislature 18 bills dealing solely with Workmen's Compensation.

The importance of these bills was made clear to the members of the Legislature, including the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, who met with the Executive officers of the Council and members of our Committee in November of last year to discuss the Council's legislative program. We were told that the bills dealing with Workmen's Compensation would be given top priority and that there would be roll calls on every bill.

Reacting to a news story appearing in a Boston newspaper early in the year, reporting that two legislators had charged that delays in settling thousands of industrial accident cases were caused by "bungling" and "administrative mismanagement" on the part of the Industrial Accident Board, President Camelio issued a release on February 5 calling on the news media to put the blame where it belongs.

"The basic cause is simple and clear," said Camelio. "Insurance companies are simply not paying compensation to injured workers or to widows in obvious and deserving cases. We accuse the insurance companies of being engaged in a massive lockout of injured workers.

"The law specifies that compensation be paid voluntarily after injury or death, and Board rules provide that payments begin within two weeks of the start of disability. But in about seven thousand cases a year, the insurance companies are refusing to make prompt payments.

"Some of this failure may be blamed on their own difficulty in investigating claims — that is, their own 'backlog' — but this could be easily cured by hiring more help. The principal reason, however, is purely economic. Insurance companies make money out of the delays.

"By refusing to pay claims when they are due, the insurance company drives the injured worker back to the job before he has made a complete

recovery, saving millions of dollars in weekly compensation. Or an injured worker is forced to hire a lawyer and file a claim before the Industrial Accident Board. He then settles the case for the best figure he can get, saving more millions of dollars for insurance companies.

"By creating a backlog of undecided cases before the Industrial Accident Board, the insurance companies are building up public pressure for changes in the Workmen's Compensation Act which would give them a free hand in deciding when to pay and when to stop payment of compensation — a pet legislative objective which has been denied them by the General Court for the past twenty years.

"Because the law does not provide adequate penalties against insurers who refuse to pay — and because the law does not give the Board the power to order payments in clear cases without a full hearing, insurance companies can get away with this lockout of injured workers and widows of industrial accident victims."

The aggregate content of the 18 bills filed by the Council if enacted would correct many inequities in the Act, improve the benefit structure, and expedite the payment of claims.

At the meeting held by this Committee on February 8, Chairman Orcutt commented on the poor coverage the release quoted above had got in the papers but an effort on his part to get better coverage by personally contacting labor editors failed to stir up enthusiasm in the press — proving only that the influence of the powerful insurance lobbies reaches out beyond the legislative chambers on Beacon Hill to the editorial chambers on Newspaper Row.

A meeting of the Committee had been held on January 16, at which time a discussion of the bills filed took place and at which Attorney Lawrence Locke pointed out that changes in the bills would have to be made to make them more effective and more presentable.

On January 11, Chairman Orcutt had a letter sent to all affiliated locals with special forms designed to acquire complete information on individual cases of injured workers in the locals affected by delays in the payment of compensation. The purpose was to prepare for the presentation of specific cases at hearings on these bills.

When our bills pertaining to Workmen's Compensation were ready, Legislative Director James A. Broyer had sent copies to the Department of Social Security of the AFL-CIO in Washington for an appraisal and any suggestion they might have for improvement of the proposals. He also asked for information from the Department of Research as to whether other states had laws already on their books bearing any similarity to our proposals.

On February 12, James R. O'Brien, Assistant Director of the AFL-CIO Department of Social Security, sent a letter with seven pages of comments on our proposals.

"These changes would, in my opinion," he wrote, "substantially improve the Massachusetts Workmen's Compensation program. The benefit structure you are proposing would move Massachusetts into a position of leadership among the states in the field of Workmen's Compensation.

"I think the administrative changes you are proposing are as important as any other in the entire package. These proposals would provide much needed incentive for insurance carriers and the Commission to conduct their activities in a much more efficient manner. I wish the Massachusetts State Labor Council every success in its efforts to secure passage of these bills. Their enactment would provide much greater protection for every working man and woman in the state."

On May 22nd a Seminar on Workmen's Compensation was held at Stonehill College in North Easton. The purpose was to apprise workers of their rights under Workmen's Compensation -- and to impress upon them that an injury suffered at work should not force them to go on public welfare and that they have the right to live their lives with self-respect and continue to make a contribution to society. Executive Vice President Joseph A. Sullivan acted as moderator and the principal speakers included President Salvatore Camelio; Committee Chairman Ronald Orcutt; Senator Allan McKinnon; Commissioners Joseph Pulgini and Joseph Donovan of the Industrial Accident Board; and Attorney Bernard Cohen, specialist on Workmen's Compensation.

Although hearings on all these bills were held as early as March 2nd and March 4th, when the Committee met on August 23rd it had to be conceded that the pace at which our legislative program have moved in the Legislature was far more slovenly than we had expected. And as we prepare this report for the convention, we find ourselves still waiting for final action on the most important measures filed.

However, we intend to keep on pushing for enactment of this program and should we meet with defeat on any measure we intend to resume the fight next year.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Members: FRED RAMSEY, *Chairman*; MICHAEL TARALLO, JOHN DAMERY, CARMINE D'OLYMPIO, ALFRED DIRIENZO, CHARLES SPILLANE, ANTONIO SVIZZERO, HENRY SARACUSA, HENRY KHOURY, JOSEPH LYDON, JOHN COTTER, JAMES LAYCOCK, ALBERT PACHECO, NICHOLAS MAGLIANO, ALFRED MCGLYNN, and JOHN A. CALLAHAN, *COPE and Education Director*.

The Committee on Housing met on December 9, 1970, with Chairman Fred Ramsey presiding. Commissioner Charkoudian of the Department of Community Affairs discussed the many aspects connected with the MHFA (Massachusetts Home Finance Association). This Agency was set up for the purpose of helping to alleviate the shortage of low income housing in Massachusetts.

Created in 1966, the Board consists of five members appointed by the Governor. Although placed in the body politic it is not subject to the supervision or control of any agency of the Commonwealth. A non-profit organization may qualify for MHFA assistance but must agree to at least 25% of construction devoted to low income housing.

Importation of foreign workers, wage schedules being paid, attorney for contractors on the job site, and determination from the Department of Labor and Industries as to their responsibilities were brought to the attention of Commissioner Charkoudian.

"Turn Key Housing" — opposed by many labor unions — has not proved its worth and is not expected to be a factor in eliminating the housing problem in Massachusetts. Neither the economy of the city nor the desires or needs of the citizens was taken into consideration by "Turn Key Operations."

Both Commissioner Charkoudian and Attorney Najam spoke on the open system approach to housing — a subject matter that needs thorough evaluating in the Building Trades. Legislation has been filed by the Department of Community Affairs for such a program and it was suggested that the trades endeavor to hold a one-day Seminar to discuss all aspects of the proposed housing program.

Legislation making it mandatory that a member of organized labor be appointed to the Housing Authority has been filed by the Massachusetts State Labor Council at the request of this Committee.

With 54,000 units of housing in Massachusetts we are not lagging behind — but there is an absolute need for additions, particularly in the low income and the elderly phases in our housing needs.

Another meeting of the Committee on Housing was held on June 21, 1971, with Chairman Fred Ramsey presiding. The members present expressed dissatisfaction that the Governor had not at that time signed into law Senate Bill No. 102, which called for the appointment of a representative of organized labor to the local Housing Authority. On July 29, however, the Governor did sign the measure into law.

Commissioner Charkoudian and Attorney Najam of the Office of Community Affairs discussed the procedures and merits embodied in House Bill No. 5576 — namely, prevailing wages, shop wages, bidding procedures, representatives of labor on the respective advisory committees, and the manner in which housing could be expedited in Massachusetts.

All members were in accord with the positive aspects as presented by Commissioner Charkoudian and Attorney Najam but no action was taken on the legislation at this meeting. The Boston Building Trades have taken a position of no action at this particular time. However, it is the intention of the Committee to keep its members informed of any additional changes affecting Chapter 149 of the General Laws.

And it was agreed that no action would be taken on the Governor's Executive Order No. 74 until such time as a positive draft would be made available to the Committee.

The Committee on Housing will continue evaluating the needs for housing, particularly low income housing in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND AFFILIATION

Members: JAMES P. LOUGHLIN, *Chairman*; HAROLD DAoust, EARL RILEY, ED MILANO, DAVID MCSWENEY, RAYMOND LAPLANTE, LAWRENCE SULLIVAN, JOHN MITCHELL, JOSEPH MCNAMARA, MIKE BOTELHO, ED MCCANN, GERARD O'LEARY, BRADFORD HAMILTON, *Secretary*; FRANKLIN MURPHY, *Regional Director*.

Back in January of 1965, Ed Townsend, then Labor Correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, wrote a report on individual freedom in which he dealt solely with trade unionism .

"For most union members," he wrote, "unions mean a voluntary surrender of individual rights and freedoms to achieve the economic power possible through group action. For other workers, unions can mean involuntary subjection to regulations and restraints for possible benefits of group action. For the government and public, unionism involves substantial questions of the rights of some as related to the rights of all."

He then went on to give a careful and thoughtful report of the constant debate between the defenders of the union shop and the advocates of right-to-work laws. At the conclusion of his article, he wrote:

"It is significant that, by and large, the most criticism of violated freedoms comes from outside the labor movement. There are exceptions, of course, but in the bulk of union membership there seems to be a balancing of conceptions of the meaning of freedom.

"Members generally are convinced that the benefits of unionism far outweigh the importance to them of surrendered rights and privileges. A sense of frustration may lead to grumbling among themselves, but when the freedom arguments are hottest they show a very high degree of solidarity behind unionism as it exists. If you asked them why, they might answer in the fewest possible words, 'It's effective.' "

In the nearly six years since Townsend wrote that piece, we have seen a continuing increase in the unionization of white collar workers even though organizing among blue collar workers either stood still or inched forward very slowly. Nevertheless, the attitude of workers in general toward unions remained pretty much the same as described in Townsend's concluding paragraphs.

However, organizing in the past two years, due to a continued rise in the rate of unemployment and the sense of job insecurity this generates among workers in all fields of endeavor, has not produced very good results. Even though the Council — as pointed out in the report of the Secretary-Treasurer — suffered a loss of only 13 locals in affiliation as compared to 46 the previous year, there was a slight loss in membership as compared to a gain in membership the year before.

We believe that the current economic picture, rather than having an adverse effect on working people relative to their attitude toward unions makes them realize more fully that without a strong labor movement the road back would be far more difficult.

Also, we would like to point out that only through solidarity can union members put the kind of pressure on Congress that will force a revamping of wage and price controls to make them equitable — and it is through affiliation with state and central labor bodies that local unions achieve solidarity. So once again we ask the cooperation of the delegates to this Convention in our efforts to achieve one hundred percent affiliation here in Massachusetts.

Following is a list of new affiliations and reaffiliations during the last fiscal year and a list of delinquent locals that had to be suspended as of June 30, 1971, in accordance with the provisions of our Constitution.

New Affiliations and Reaffiliations

1970 - 1971

AFSC&ME No. 204, Adams
AFSC&ME No. 414, Billerica
Service Employees No. 285, Boston
Machinists No. 1898, Boston
Litho & Photo Engravers No. 300, Boston
Bakery & Conf. Wkrs. No. 20-B, Boston
IUMSWA Bo. 25, E. Boston, (Reaff.)
UPP No. 1039, Fitchburg
Machinists No. 1973, Framingham
UPP No. 204, Haverhill
AFSC&ME No. 1730, Hathorne
Machinists No. 1050, Needham
Plumbers & Steamfitters No. 77, New Bedford
AFSC&ME No. 165, Northampton
AFSC&ME No. 1383, Revere
Field Reps. Fed. Union No. 3017, Spgfld.
AFSC&ME No. 1313, Waltham
AFSC&ME No. 1368, Taunton ..
AFSC&ME No. 1729, Taunton
Barbers No. 33, Westfield (Reaff.)
Barbers No. 186, Worcester (Reaff.)
USA No. 2285, Worcester

Delinquent Locals Suspended**June 30, 1971**

AFSC&ME No. 164, Boston
AFSC&ME No. 783, Boston
AFSC&ME No. 944, Boston
AFSC&ME No. 1796, Boston
Meat Cutters No. 618, Boston
Musicians No. 535, Boston
Railway Clerks No. 2119, Boston
AFSC&ME No. 503, Bridgewater
Longshoremens No. 1660, Charlestown
D.A.L.U. No. 24480, Chester
D.A.L.U. No. 23545, Everett
Plumbers No. 135, Fall River
AFSC&ME No. 687, Gloucester
Electrical Wkrs. No. 761, Greenfield
Stage Employees No. 596, Greenfield
Stage Employees No. 381, Haverhill
Firemen & Oilers No. 4, Holyoke
D.A.L.U. No. 22451, Lawrence
Printing Spec. & Paper Prod. No. 664, Lowell
Stage Employees No. 36, Lowell
Allies Ind. Wkrs. No. 839, Middleboro
Jewelry Wkrs. No. 19, Newburyport
AFSC&ME No. 464, Norfolk
Barbers No. 34, Northampton
Labor Council, Pittsfield
AFSC&ME No. 1204, Pittsfield
D.A.L.U. No. 24024, Rockland
Amal. Transit No. 1512, Springfield
Barbers No. 711, Waltham
Electrical Wkrs. No. 1267, Waltham
AFSC&ME No. 877, Worcester
USA No. 2825, Everett
USA No. 5392, Watertown
USA No. 5532, Taunton

**MASSACHUSETTS STATE LABOR
COUNCIL, AFL-CIO**

REPORT ON AUDIT

JUNE 30, 1971

FLAHERTY, BLISS AND COMPANY

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

40 COURT STREET

BOSTON

August 25, 1971

Massachusetts State Labor Council, AFL-CIO
6 Beacon Street
Boston, Massachusetts

Gentlemen:

In accordance with instructions we have made an examination of the books and records of Massachusetts State Labor Council, AFL-CIO, for the year ended June 30, 1971. We have prepared and attached hereto the following financial statements:

- Exhibit 1* Balance Sheet — June 30, 1971
- Exhibit 2* Statement of Income and Expense and Analysis of Net Worth — For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1971
- Schedule 1* Statement of Membership — For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1971
- Schedule 2* Analysis of 1970 Convention Expense

COMMENTS

<i>Cash — General Fund</i>	\$84,993.90
<i>Cash — Restricted</i>	\$12,461.59

The cash consisted of the following:

General Fund Cash

First National Bank of Boston—Checking Accounts:

General Fund	\$37,739.18
Year Book Fund	26,016.42

Total Checking Accounts	63,755.60
-------------------------------	-----------

Petty Cash Fund	25.00
-----------------------	-------

Provident Institution for Savings:

Savings Account	10,568.65
Certificate of Deposit — due 6/5/72	10,644.65

Total General Fund Cash	\$84,993.90
-------------------------------	-------------

Restricted Cash

First National Bank of Boston—Checking Accounts:

Benefit Plan	\$ 189.28
COPE (2 Accounts)	12,272.31

Total Restricted Cash	\$12,461.59
-----------------------------	-------------

We received from The First National Bank of Boston and the Provident Institution for Savings statements of cash balances at June 30, 1971, and we have reconciled those statements of balances with the books.

The balances of the COPE accounts (\$12,272.31) are restricted and may be used only for political, educational and administration expenses, within the provisions of state and federal laws.

At June 30, 1971 there has been included in Dues Receivable from Affiliates an amount for COPE of \$1,193.98 and when the Dues Receivable of June 30, 1971 (\$11,363.72) has been collected the amount included for COPE of \$1,193.98 will be transferred to a COPE restricted cash account.

<i>Dues Receivable from Affiliates</i>	\$11,363.72
--	-------------

Our examination of the records showed the above amount represents the total of the open balances at June 30, 1971.

At June 30, 1971 certain affiliated local unions had not paid their current per capita dues and these unpaid items amounted to \$11,363.72. None of the balances has been verified by correspondence.

<i>Bonds—Federal Home Loan Banks—Due 11/26/71—Par</i>	\$5,000.00
---	------------

The security belongs to the General Fund and consists of one bond for \$5,000.00 due 11/26/71, rate 8.2%, Series E 1971.

We examined the bond on August 19, 1971 at the safe deposit box located at The First National Bank of Boston.

<i>Accounts Payable</i>	\$7,426.00
-------------------------------	------------

Unpaid liabilities applicable to the year ended June 30, 1971 consist of the following:

Office Employees, Local No. 6	85.00
Lavigne Scholarship Award to be made	
at 1971 Convention	1,000.00
Kennedy Scholarship Award to be made	
at 1971 Convention	1,000.00
Essay Scholarship Award to be made	
at 1971 Convention	500.00
Excelsior Press — For Printing Expenses	
related to the 1970 Convention	4,841.00
	<hr/>
<i>Total</i>	\$ 7,426.00

The above items are current and we have been informed that all known liabilities of consequence have been entered on the books at June 30, 1971.

<i>Accrued Taxes</i>	\$ 7,242.70
----------------------------	-------------

At June 30, 1971 there was accrued and unpaid the following items:

Employees Federal Income Tax Withheld	\$ 1,831.44
Employees Massachusetts Income Tax Withheld ..	567.88
F.I.C.A. Taxes (Employer and Employees)	947.84
Massachusetts Unemployment Tax	174.41
Federal Unemployment Tax	208.11
Federal Income Tax (1970 Year Book	
Expense)	3,513.02
	<hr/>
<i>Total</i>	\$ 7,242.70

<i>Due from Affiliates Received in Advance</i>	\$ 617.84
--	-----------

Certain affiliated unions had paid in advance their per capita dues of \$617.84 and these dues are applicable to the period starting July 1, 1971 and we have deferred this amount of dues to the next accounting period.

1971 Year Book Advertising Received in Advance (net) \$23,809.33

During the year under review there was received and paid out for the 1971 Year Book the following:

Receipts for Advertising	\$82,352.25
Less: Commissions incurred in securing advertising	58,542.92
<i>Net Receipts</i>	<u>\$23,809.33</u>

The 1971 Year Book will not be published until after July 1, 1971 and so the above income and expense have been deferred to the next accounting period.

GENERAL COMMENTS

In general, we have examined accounting records and other supporting evidence submitted for our inspection, by methods and to the extent we deemed appropriate. While a review of the accounting procedures and system has been made, we did not make a detailed audit of the transactions.

In our opinion, the accompanying Balance Sheet at June 30, 1971 and the Statement of Income and Expense and Analysis of Net Worth for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1971, and related schedules fairly present the financial position of Massachusetts State Labor Council, AFL-CIO at June 30, 1971 and the results of its operation for the year ended, in accordance with accepted principles of accounting applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.

Respectfully submitted,

FLAHERTY, BLISS AND COMPANY

Exhibit 1

MASSACHUSETTS STATE LABOR COUNCIL, AFL-CIO
BALANCE SHEET
JUNE 30, 1971

ASSETS

Cash—General Fund	\$ 84,933.90
Cash—Restricted Funds	12,461.59
Dues Receivable from Affiliates	11,363.72
Bonds—Federal Home Loan Banks— Due 11/26/71—Par	5,000.00
Deposit (American Airlines Travel Credit)	425.00
Deferred Charges—1971 Convention Expense	834.84
Interest Accrued	205.00
TOTAL ASSETS	\$115,284.05

LIABILITIES—DEFERRED CREDITS—NET WORTH

Liabilities:

Accounts Payable	7,426.00
Accrued Taxes	7,242.70
Total Liabilities	14,688.70

Deferred Credits:

Dues from Affiliates Received in Advance	\$ 617.84
1971 Year Book Advertising Received in Advance	\$82,352.25
Less: Commissions Paid on above Advertising	58,542.92 23,809.33
Total Deferred Credits	24,427.17

Net Worth—Divided as Follows:

General Fund	61,595.21
COPE	14,592.97 76,188.18

TOTAL LIABILITIES—DEFERRED CREDITS— NET WORTH	\$115,284.05
--	---------------------

Note: The above statement is part of a report dated August 25, 1971 and is subject to the comments contained therein.

Exhibit 2

**MASSACHUSETTS STATE LABOR COUNCIL, AFL-CIO
STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENSE
AND ANALYSIS OF NET WORTH
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1971**

<i>Income</i>	<i>COPE Funds</i>	<i>General Funds</i>	<i>Total</i>
Per Capita Tax from Affiliated			
Locals	\$29,399.96	\$237,130.62	\$266,530.58
Transfer to COPE from General			
Funds	15,000.00	(15,000.00)	\$ 16,250.00
Contributions from			
Washington, D. C.	16,250.00		
Other Contributions	462.00		462.00
Interest		1,556.07	1,556.07
Receipts from 1970 Year Book			
Advertising	\$65,260.60	10.10	10.10
Less: Expenses &			
Commissions	46,583.07	18,677.53	18,677.53
<i>Total Income</i>	<u>\$ 61,111.96</u>	<u>\$242,374.32</u>	<u>\$303,486.28</u>
<i>Expense</i>			
Salaries:			
Secretary-Treasurer		\$ 16,420.00	\$ 16,420.00
Legislative Director		14,891.15	14,891.15
COPE Director		13,871.92	13,871.92
Co-ordinator		8,250.00	8,250.00
Public Relations Director.....		12,852.69	12,852.69
Clerical		35,448.40	35,448.40
Travel and Expense:			
Legislative Department (including			
Consultant's fee of \$2,600.00)		9,003.97	9,003.97
Education Department		131.04	131.04
COPE Department	2,547.76		2,547.76
Public Relations Department.....		840.75	840.75
President		3,824.90	3,824.90
Secretary-Treasurer		3,334.66	3,334.66
Vice Presidents		579.00	579.00
Legal Advisor		4,558.00	4,558.00
Rent and Light		11,405.97	11,405.97
Auditing Expense		1,975.00	1,975.00
Office Expense		1,425.24	1,425.24
Cost of Life Insurance and Retirement			
Program for Employees		5,270.14	5,270.14
1970 Convention Expense			
(See Schedule 2)		27,187.69	27,187.69

Tickets	4,672.50	4,672.50
Executive Council Meetings and Expense ..	8,253.09	8,253.09
Insurance	559.00	559.00
Essay Contest and Scholarship Award	4,424.95	4,424.95
<i>Totals Forwarded</i>	<u>\$2,547.76</u>	<u>\$189,180.06</u>
		<u>\$191,727.82</u>

MASSACHUSETTS STATE LABOR COUNCIL, AFL-CIO
STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENSE
AND ANALYSIS OF NET WORTH
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1971

<i>Income</i>	<i>COPE Funds</i>	<i>General Funds</i>	<i>Total</i>
Totals Brought Forward	\$ 2,547.76	\$189,180.06	\$191,727.82
Messenger Service		397.05	397.05
Printing Expense of Newsletter		6,579.00	6,579.00
Physically Handicapped Program and Awards		448.00	448.00
Watt Fellowship Program		3,747.20	3,747.20
Kennedy and Lavigne Scholarships and Awards		2,000.00	2,000.00
Payroll Taxes	901.96	5,122.71	6,024.67
Telephone and Telegraph		4,039.43	4,039.43
Miscellaneous	10.57	819.16	829.73
Blue Cross - Blue Shield Expense		3,953.90	3,953.90
Dues to Affiliated Organizations		465.70	465.70
Donations and Subscriptions		2,382.90	2,382.90
Public Stenographer Expense		321.00	321.00
Postage		9,554.59	9,554.59
Expense of Community Service		875.00	875.00
Labor Day Expense		240.50	240.50
Legislative Directories and Roll Call Records		1,434.79	1,434.79
Various Conferences and Seminars		4,307.60	4,307.60
Workmen's Compensation Booklets (Expense \$1,864.30—Income \$1,127.40)		736.90	736.90
COPE Election and Other COPE Expenses	62,866.99		62,866.99
<i>Total Expense</i>	66,327.28	241,733.89	308,061.17
Net (Loss) Income for the Fiscal Year <i>Ended June 30, 1971</i>	(5,215.32)	640.43	(4,574.89)
Net Worth — June 30, 1970	19,808.29	60,954.78	80,763.07
Net Worth — June 30, 1971	\$14,592.97	\$ 61,595.21	\$ 76,188.18

Schedule 1

MASSACHUSETTS STATE LABOR COUNCIL, AFL-CIO
STATEMENT OF MEMBERSHIP
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1971

Affiliated Organizations — July 1, 1970	879
Add: Affiliated Organizations accepted during the year	22
<i>Total</i>	<u>901</u>
<i>Deduct: Affiliated Organizations Lost during the year (by mergers, withdrawals, suspensions and adjustment)</i>	<u>35</u>
<i>Affiliated Organizations — June 30, 1971</i>	866

Schedule 2

MASSACHUSETTS STATE LABOR COUNCIL, AFL-CIO
ANALYSIS OF 1970 CONVENTION EXPENSE
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Printing of Proceedings, Reports, Resolutions, Credentials, etc.	\$12,293.52
Hotel, Hall Rental, Rooms, Meals, Gratuities, etc.(1)	6,229.23
Convention Badges	1,142.57
Stenotyping and Typewriting	703.06
Entertainment	850.00
Convention Photos and Signs	1,367.81
Massachusetts Union Label Service	1,000.00
Miscellaneous	<u>3,601.50</u>
<i>Total</i>	\$27,187.69

Notes: (1) This amount has been reduced by Registration Fees (which fee included dinner charge) in the amount of \$7,161.50)

(2) The above statement is part of a report dated August 25, 1971 and is subject to the comments contained therein.

